

CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

FRIDAY, May 15, 1998

Washington Post

May 15, 1998

Pg. 1

Chaos Tests Ties To The Pentagon

Despite Recent Access, U.S. Now Lacks Window on Strife in Indonesian Army

By Dana Priest
Washington Post
Staff Writer

JAKARTA, May 14—For five years the U.S. military has sent a continual parade of generals and teams of elite troops to Indonesia in an effort to gain access and influence within the insular military forces that dominate the world's fourth-most populous country.

As a result, the U.S. military now has more contact with the Indonesian military than with any other in Asia, except South Korea's. Despite a congressional ban on some military aid, U.S. Special Forces have been scheduled this year to conduct nearly monthly training exercises with Indonesian units. Top U.S. officers boast a network of contacts cultivated at the highest levels of the Indonesian officer corps.

But as the country has erupted into chaos, the U.S. military, despite its investment here, has been shut out from the inner workings of the armed forces, including a possible power struggle that could di-

vide the 400,000-troop force.

Today, as Indonesian military leaders were closeted at Cilangkap, their headquarters, hashing out what could be a new military coordinating body with martial law powers, the U.S. Defense Department postponed a mission by Adm. Joseph Prueher, commander-in-chief of the U.S. Pacific Command. The trip was put off on the recommendation of U.S. Ambassador Stapleton Roy, in part, officials in Washington said, because the unrest has made the drive from the Jakarta airport hazardous.

Prueher, who is based at the command headquarters in Honolulu and has made numerous trips here, was to meet with armed forces chief Gen. Wiranto and Lt. Gen. Subianto Prabowo, another military leader seen as his rival, and tell them that world opinion would not support the use of lethal force by the military against demonstrators. He would not, however, advocate that the military leadership abandon President Suharto, defense of-

officials said.

During the past week, amid congressional criticism, the Pentagon has ordered the postponement of a training mission here and announced other moves to scale back contacts between the two militaries. But senior defense sources said Prueher views the suspension of the U.S. training as a temporary measure and has told Wiranto that he wants to continue it when the situation calms and Indonesian troops are not in the streets confronting students.

"It is important to maintain military-to-military contacts," Prueher said in an interview last week, the day after the suspension of the training exercises, a jumpmaster program that would have involved 50 U.S. Army Special Forces troops over a month. "Indonesia is important to the United States, and it is in our interest that Indonesia gets through this."

Despite congressional bans on small-arms sales and on certain U.S. military education programs that allow foreign officers to attend military

schools in the United States, the Defense Department's in-country training program has grown steadily since 1992, when 10-man U.S. Special Forces detachments made three trips to Indonesia to train troops in close-quarters combat. This year 10 training exercises were planned and four had already taken place when the jumpmaster course was cut short.

The training, which would cost \$3.5 million this year, has included basic infantry skills, rapid rappelling from helicopters, how to conduct amphibious assaults, how to blow up buildings and raid enemy-controlled territory, and detailed instruction on how U.S. Special Forces plan their missions.

U.S. military officers involved in the program counter congressional criticism by saying the training is a way to maintain access in a place where it is hard to come by, and to expose Indonesian soldiers and officers to U.S. values, such as respect for human rights and civilian control of the military.

"My take is, if you don't talk, you're guaranteed to achieve zip," Brig. Gen. Norton

Riots Rage in Indonesian Capital

Suharto Returns; Violence Reveals Deep Rift in Military

Washington Post...See Pg. 2

Journey into the unknown

Somber ceremony begins mission to identify soldier

Washington Times...See Pg. 4

Pakistan Weighs Response To India

U.S. Team To Argue Against Nuclear Test

Washington Post...See Pg. 4



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



A. Schwartz, commander of U.S. Special Operations in the Pacific Command, said in an interview last week.

Similar reasoning has been behind U.S. military relations with a succession of foreign militaries, in countries such as El Salvador, with poor human rights records and dubious vocations for democratic reform. In some cases, U.S. military officials have discovered that they ultimately have less influence than they believed with their allied officers fighting internal enemies.

The stakes in Indonesia are seen as especially large because of the dominant role of the military here. The armed forces, while relatively small for a country of more than 200 million people, hold seats in parliament, own sectors of the economy and act as the internal security force.

Because of this, "our military-to-military relationship in this region goes beyond the traditional military-to-military

relationship," said a senior U.S. defense official.

In January, Defense Secretary William Cohen visited Suharto in Jakarta to discuss expanding security ties in what aides said then was intended as a gesture of support. At the time, Cohen focused on talk of continuity and stability in military relations rather than on the financial and political crisis.

The Indonesian military has been accused of serious human rights violations, including mass killings in East Timor, an island Indonesia occupied in 1975. They have been accused by human rights groups of kidnapping and killing suspected insurgents and their supporters in three outlying regions and of detaining and torturing political dissidents.

Most U.S. training has been conducted by the Special Forces, the most elite units in the U.S. armed forces, with their counterparts in an elite Indonesian unit known as

Kopassus, which until March was commanded by Prabowo. Although among the most highly trained and disciplined in the country, they also have been accused of serious human rights violations, charges Prabowo has denied.

The training program, known as J-CET for Joint Combined Exchange and Training, is designed primarily to provide training for U.S. troops. Special Forces officials say the Indonesian program has allowed U.S. soldiers of the 1st Special Forces Group based in Okinawa, Japan, to practice skills that are politically sensitive to practice on the Japanese bases, such as helicopter infiltration and demolitions.

The training, as well as a tradition of future Indonesian generals who attended U.S. officer schools before the congressional ban, has created an American following among Indonesian troops. To maintain the American influence over the

development of young officers, Prabowo sends 25 lieutenants a year at Indonesian expense to VMI and the Citadel.

Prabowo, who is married to one of Suharto's daughters, is seen as involved in a rivalry with Wiranto. "There is a battle within the Armed Forces between the pro-Suharto and pro-reform elements," said one U.S. defense official.

Prabowo is a favorite in some American military quarters, where his ease in English and his familiarity with American culture has smoothed the way for a comfortable relationship. The Special Forces training, in particular, helped boost his prestige and over the past several years he is believed to have doubled the number of Kopassus troops from 4,000 to 8,000.

"The U.S. military assistance program has benefitted him greatly," said one U.S. businessman with close ties to the military.

Washington Post

May 15, 1998

Pg. 1

Riots Rage In Indonesian Capital

Suharto Returns; Violence Reveals Deep Rift In Military

By Keith B. Richburg
Washington Post
Foreign Service

JAKARTA, Indonesia, May 14—Indonesia's capital erupted in an orgy of rioting and looting today, with young protesters burning hundreds of stores, vehicles and offices across the city, sending panicked residents fleeing for the airport or for safety in downtown hotels. The riots exposed publicly, for the first time, the serious rifts within the Indonesian armed forces.

The death toll from today's violence was uncertain. The Chinatown section of North Jakarta, particularly hard hit, was said by witnesses to be devastated. Indonesia's minority

ethnic Chinese community has in the past become the target of popular rage because of its economic dominance. Elsewhere in the city, businesses hoping to avoid burning and looting posted signs that said "Pribumi," meaning "native Indonesian."

Around Jakarta, homes and businesses belonging to long-serving President Suharto's relatives and close associates were singled out to be torched and gutted.

The violence forced schools and most businesses to close, disrupted transportation and caused delays or cancellations of most flights because of rioting along the main access road to the airport. Tonight, plumes of black smoke could be seen

rising from several sections of the city.

[Suharto arrived in Jakarta early Friday morning after cutting short a trip to Egypt. He was greeted by Vice President B.J. Habibie, Defense Minister Gen. Wiranto, who is also armed forces chief, and other members of his cabinet. The president did not speak to reporters and, guarded by troops and 100 military vehicles, was driven in a convoy to his central Jakarta residence.]

Today's citywide riots, the worst in the capital in recent memory, seemed to further shake Suharto's regime and add to speculation that his departure from the scene may be imminent. All the top armed forces generals, including the regional

commanders, were known to be meeting throughout the day and evening behind a ring of armored vehicles at the Defense Ministry compound here. Well-placed diplomatic and other sources said a decision may already have been made to form a new military crisis coordinating group, with the only key remaining question being which of them would take the lead.

Suharto was reported to have told an audience in Egypt that if he has lost the people's trust, he would not use force to stay in power. That statement, and the apparent moves by the military tonight to set up a new crisis council, further fueled speculation that Indonesia could be at the brink of a dramatic change in leadership for the first time in 32 years of Suharto's unchallenged, one-man rule. Suharto, 76, was reelected in March to a seventh

EARLY BIRD WEBSITE

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

consecutive five-year term by an assembly he largely hand-picked; tonight, analysts said it was possible that same assembly could be recalled in a special session to consider a vote of no confidence in Suharto.

"You can predict what has to happen," a Western diplomat said. "The most likely endgame is a special session of the [assembly]. . . . But who do you put in who would satisfy the students?"

[In Washington, Clinton administration officials were said to sense, as one presidential assistant put it, that "elite opinion is starting to jell" against Suharto's government.]

As Wiranto, the armed forces commander, today appeared before the press to apologize for Tuesday's shooting deaths of six unarmed student demonstrators -- which sparked today's spasm of violence -- his forces appeared deeply divided over how to handle the continuing violence. At least one unit of marines, in scarlet berets and holding swagger sticks, briefly marched alongside the protesters, who responded with cheers and handshakes, and then engaged in a tense standoff at a key intersection with helmeted riot policemen who fired tear gas and rubber bullets to disperse the crowds.

That extraordinary scene played out on the riot-torn Salemba Raya street, a main commercial strip near the center of town, close to the University of Indonesia's medical school. The marines marched with the crowd for about a half mile, their automatic weapons slung casually across their backs, amid chants of "Long live the marines!"

"We're just making sure there's no violence, no looting, so the people can focus their energies," said a young lieutenant strolling alongside the demonstrators.

At the intersection of Salemba Raya and Pramuka streets, the marines formed a line between the protesters and the riot policemen. As protesters taunted the police with shouts of "You fat policeman!" and "Is it time for your afternoon nap?", the marines tried to calm the crowd. One marine advised the demonstrators, "You shouldn't stare them in the face -- that's what makes

them hate you."

The riot police charged the crowd after nearly an hour of taunting, firing volleys of tear gas and chasing down some protesters and hitting them with rattan canes. Some shoving and shouting broke out between policemen and marines, who tried to protect the protesters. "What are they thinking?" shouted one marine as police fired at demonstrators. "They're not supposed to do that!" Reporters saw marines shouting obscenities at policemen, and in one tense moment, a policeman leveled his automatic weapon a few inches from a marine's chest and threatened to fire, until he was pulled away by colleagues.

"The marines are on the side of the people, because they are wiser," said Laurent, a university mathematics teacher who came out to watch the protest.

A young man in a T-shirt said of the marines, "They come with their guns on their backs. The other ones, the police, always stand with their guns ready to shoot. That's why all people hate the police."

Diplomats said the spectacle of marines appearing to side with the demonstrators and engaging in a public confrontation with police must be sobering for Suharto, who for the first time must question the loyalty of at least one faction of his military.

The anti-Suharto protests began relatively peacefully in February as student-led demonstrations, largely confined to university campuses, called mainly for general reform of the country's closed political system. But in recent weeks, as the protests have grown and spread across the country, emboldened students have begun marching beyond their campus gates, shifting their demands from reforming the system to insisting that Suharto step down.

Until last week, the students had drawn sympathy but no active participation from other groups. Then the government imposed hefty increases on the price of fuel and electricity, as mandated by the International Monetary Fund, and that move -- coming atop the widespread hardship already felt because of the country's economic collapse -- turned simmering public dis-

content into outright anger at the regime.

Students today largely stayed on their campuses and did not riot. The people on the streets shouted that their movement marked a new "people power" uprising in Indonesia. In reality, it appeared to be a spasm of destruction and looting.

"This has nothing to do with politics," a Western diplomat said. "This is rage -- 30 years of rage."

Overall today, the official Antara news agency said police shot and killed two people. The military reported three soldiers killed but provided no details. Other, unconfirmed reports put the day's casualty toll at 20 or more, many of them ethnic Chinese.

Not all the violence was random, as the rioters particularly targeted businesses associated with Suharto relatives and cronies. The house of wealthy Chinese businessman Liem Soei Liong, a close Suharto associate, was said to have been burned to the ground. Also torched was an office of the government Social Affairs Department, now headed by Suharto's daughter, Siti Hardijanti Rukmana, known as Tutut.

On Salemba Raya, the mob attacked a showroom of the Bimantara car company owned by Suharto's son Bambang Trihatmodjo; rioters ripped open the metal shutters, dragged out office furniture and tires and created a huge bonfire in the middle of the street, then rolled out new Cakra cars and set them ablaze.

"They're attacking the businesses of the children of the president," said a 24-year-old office clerk who watched the showroom's destruction. "We can't go directly to the headquarters, so we're attacking his branches."

At the campus of the ABA-ABI university, students stayed behind the gates but used a megaphone to address young

people on the streets outside. "Long live the people!" a student leader shouted. "Bring down Suharto!"

Across the street from the university, a crowd had set fire to a small shopping center containing a Dunkin' Donuts shop, a book store and a grocery store, and some people had gone inside to loot.

Across the city, businesses seemed to side with the protesters today -- either out of sympathy for their cause or to avoid being burned and looted.

Even as military leaders jockeyed for power and searched for a solution, the military also warned that it would crack down on looters. "We must face rioters and looters firmly," Maj. Gen. Syafrie Syamsudin, the Jakarta military commander, said on local television.

The military has moved about 15,000 troops into the capital to deal with the violence.

The U.S. Embassy today was among several foreign missions announcing plans for the departure of nonessential people. But a diplomat said the order was largely not in force since it was too difficult to reach the airport and most flights out were fully booked by Indonesians trying to flee.

[In Washington, the State Department advised Americans to postpone travel to Indonesia. It also announced that a trip by a U.S. military delegation led by Adm. Joseph W. Prueher, commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific, would be postponed indefinitely because of the chaos and questions about whether Suharto's return would complicate efforts to hold meetings with key officials. Officials continued to urge Suharto to try to calm the violence by beginning a dialogue with opponents.]

Staff writer Dana Priest and special correspondent Cindy Shiner in Jakarta and staff writer Dan Balz in Berlin contributed to this report.

Washington Post May 15, 1998 Pg. 30 Duma Vote May Delay START II Ratification

MOSCOW—The lower house of the Russian parliament, the State Duma, rejected a proposal to create a special commission to streamline work on the START II strategic arms treaty, signaling a possible further delay. The Russian parliament has not ratified the treaty, which was signed in 1993 by then-president George Bush and Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

Journey into the unknown

Somber ceremony begins mission to identify soldier

By Jennifer Harper
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

For 14 years, the bone fragments of an American killed in Vietnam were sealed in a casket under 7 tons of granite at the Tomb of the Unknowns.

At Arlington National Cemetery yesterday, the casket stood in the morning sunlight, draped in an American flag, the remains within to be tested for identification.

"If it be your holy will, make known the identity of this unknown Vietnam serviceman and bring peace of mind to an American family," Army chaplain Col. Joseph O'Keefe said during an hourlong disinterment ceremony.

Two weeks ago, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen made the difficult and unprecedented decision to unseal the tomb. The family of Air Force 1st Lt. Michael Blassie has offered evidence that the remains are those of Lt. Blassie, who was shot down over Vietnam in 1972.

Members of several families stood opposite the casket, united by the possibility that the remains might be those of a lost son, brother or husband. Defense Department experts have narrowed down the probable identity of the remains to nine missing men.

"It means so much to be here," said Pat Blassie, younger sister of Lt. Blassie. After the solemn cere-

mony, she was hemmed in by boom microphones and a few pushy journalists who insisted their questions be answered first.

"We believe this is Michael," she continued. "I didn't expect it to be such an emotional time. But Michael represents 2,000 people also missing in action in Vietnam. They are part of this, too."

Steve Amesbury brought his two small sons, Conor and Ryan, to the ceremony that honored the grandfather they never met — Air Force Maj. Harry Amesbury, who was shot down in his C-130 transport plane over Vietnam in 1972.

"This is the closest I will get to a funeral for my father," Mr. Amesbury said. "It's been 26 years since he's been gone, and some say, 'Just let it go.' I can't. This was my father. You want to know what happened. You want some closure."

"If this is not my father, if it's not possible to identify him, I'll accept that," Mr. Amesbury added.

At the time of his decision, Mr. Cohen said he had to choose between the sanctity of the tomb and honoring America's commitment to identifying fallen soldiers.

"We disturb this hallowed ground with profound reluctance," Mr. Cohen said yesterday to a crowd that included military brass, members of Congress, Vietnam veterans and a phalanx of media kept at bay by uniformed military guards.

"If advances in technology can ease the lingering anguish of even one family, then our path is clear," Mr. Cohen said.

The disinterment ceremony itself, punctuated by the precision of an honor guard and brass band,

was brief but poignant. Hundreds of tourists milling about on the manicured grounds below the tomb halted and remained silent for the duration.

The remains were taken by military escort to Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington. They will be analyzed with DNA testing at an armed forces laboratory in Rockville. Results could take 90 days.

Army historian Tom Sherlock said the actual disinterment took five hours on Wednesday. Workers used a diamond blade to delicately split the seams of the crypt, then dug down 6 feet to reach the casket, which he said was in good condition.

"Everything is back in place now," Mr. Sherlock said.

The decision to open the tomb has uncovered some mixed feelings, however. At least one of the families involved disagrees with the decision, saying it won't change anything. Last week, an American Legion spokesman acknowledged, "It's going to be a real hurt for some people."

Though he was moved by yesterday's ceremony, Thomas Burch of the National Vietnam Veterans Coalition said he is weary of mistaken identities and limited information on America's missing service members.

"Though [the Defense Department] has done the right thing today," he said, "there's still the issue of using the identities and even the remains of armed forces members to achieve political objectives. They have to make more of an effort to get the information to the families."

Washington Post

May 15, 1998

Pg. 29

Pakistan Weighs Response To India

U.S. Team To Argue Against Nuclear Test

By Steven Mufson
Washington Post
Foreign Service

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan, May 14—Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif met for four hours today with his cabinet and military leaders to weigh whether Pakistan would restrain itself from matching this week's nuclear tests by regional rival India or risk international economic sanctions and explode its own nuclear device.

A four-sentence statement released after the meeting concluded did not indicate that any decision had yet been made, saying only that the group "noted with satisfaction that the country's state of preparedness and defense capability can deter any threat emanating from any quarter."

Local newspapers quoted defense officials as saying that Pakistan is already preparing for nuclear tests in the near future and quoted Foreign

Minister Gohar Ayub Khan as declaring Wednesday that "a nuclear weapons race is on in the region now." Today Ayub Khan asserted that "what India has done is short of a declaration of war."

In an interview in his home tonight, Information Minister Mashalof Hussein, a close confidant of the prime minister, played down Ayub Khan's reported remarks. He said that the government was waiting for the arrival Friday of a U.S. delega-

tion led by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbot and watching to see how the international community would respond to India's nuclear tests.

Talbot and Marine Corps Gen. Anthony Zinni will meet with military and civilian leaders here in an effort to reinforce the appeal for restraint that President Clinton gave to Sharif on Wednesday. Talbot and Zinni are expected to return on Saturday, and it is not certain that they will meet with the prime minister on their visit.

Administration officials traveling with Clinton in Europe sounded clearly worried that their appeals will be spurned. "We are watching it

carefully," a senior official said of the Pakistani situation. "There are some signs that are troubling."

Deputy National Security Adviser James Steinberg said the United States is "especially concerned" about trying to persuade Pakistan that it stands to gain more in the eyes of the international community by showing restraint than by retaliating against India by setting off a nuclear explosion that would further destabilize the region.

Hussein said, however, that "the core issue is whether there is a price tag to India's behavior." In addition to the aid cut-off signed by Clinton on Wednesday, Japan, Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Sweden and the Netherlands have imposed various bans on assistance to or cooperation with India this week.

Hussein said the government of this overwhelmingly Muslim nation -- created in 1947 specifically to give British India's Muslim population a homeland -- was alarmed not only by the tests but by what he called the "very lethal combination" of militarism and Hindu nationalism in India.

"The bomb is one thing, but there's a whole ideology, a world view," he said, referring to India's ruling Bharatiya Janata Party, a Hindu-nationalist organization came to

power in March and long had pledged to test nuclear devices. "It's a double headed monster: militarism and neo-Hinduism. That's why we're looking to the international community to contain Indian expansionism and Indian ambitions." The minister added that any sanctions imposed on India therefore "should go beyond tokenism."

For its part, Pakistan has been living with U.S. sanctions since 1990, when the United States cut off \$650 million in aid because it believed Pakistan had a nuclear bomb. Clinton administration officials are saying that Pakistan should be compensated in some way for the failure of the United States to deliver F-16 fighter jets bought in the late 1980s but never delivered because of the sanctions. Pakistan is still out \$500 million that it paid for F-16s, and Clinton has said the United States will seek to find another buyer for the planes.

Key members of Congress have indicated in the past two days that they would be amenable to repealing the law under which Pakistan was sanctioned if Pakistan now refrains from nuclear tests.

Hussein said that the Pakistani government was wary of U.S. assurances in the wake of the Indian explosions. He cited an April 2 letter that Pakistan's

prime minister wrote to President Clinton that warned that "we have every reason to believe" that the new Indian government's pronouncement on exercising the nuclear weapons option "connotes a giant step towards fully operationalizing Indian nuclear policy."

Afterward, the U.S. envoy to the United Nations, Bill Richardson, visited India and Pakistan. "Richardson came and said 'Don't worry about those guys. It's just election rhetoric.' We forewarned the United States, and the U.S. told us not to worry," Hussein said.

In Washington today, the State Department made its strongest assertion yet that the U.S. assessment of India's intentions had been determined in part by misinformation provided by the new government. State Department spokesman James P. Rubin told reporters: "We had, in recent weeks and months, 20 very high-level contacts with the Indian government, in which we made clear the consequences of a failure to have restraint. And, frankly, they engaged in a campaign of duplicity. . . . We were misled."

Opinion among ordinary Pakistanis seemed divided between those demanding an effort to swiftly develop a nuclear bomb and those who feared that a hasty response might invite international economic sanc-

tions and stifle the economic recovery that Sharif, a former businessman, has made the centerpiece of his government's program.

"The human reaction is: If you slap me, I should slap you," said a stock broker from Karachi, who has watched share prices slump by more than 8 percent since India's tests. "But the positive reaction is that I should keep my mouth shut instead of throwing stones."

A university professor from Karachi said she thought the race for military power was "frightening."

"I don't see what we achieve by destroying each other," she said. "And unless we have the intention of using the bombs, what's the point? It's better to be economically strong."

But Khalid Ahmed, a Pakistani businessman, pointed to an article on the front page of a Karachi newspaper about India's tests and said: "Pakistan should also do that. Why not? If you want stability in the region, we should have balance. . . . That way, both countries would know the consequences [of war]."

"The pressure," Ahmed added, "is now increasing on the decision makers."

Staff writers Dan Balz in Berlin and Thomas W. Lippman in Washington contributed to this report.

Washington Post

May 15, 1998

Pg. 33

CIA Detects Preparations For Blast In Pakistan

By WALTER PINCUS
Washington Post Staff Writer

CIA Director George J. Tenet yesterday told House and Senate intelligence oversight committees that U.S. satellites have detected preparations by Pakistan for an underground nuclear test that could occur as soon as next week, sources said.

In closed sessions before the com-

mittees, Tenet presented satellite imagery depicting an increase in equipment, technicians and security activities at a test site in the Chagai Hills, near Pakistan's border with Iran, said the sources, who spoke on the condition of anonymity.

Tenet was summoned before the committees to explain why U.S. intelligence agencies had failed to predict that India would carry out five nuclear bomb tests this week, the country's first since 1974.

Tenet testified that India deceived U.S. intelligence satellites, in part because of information it received in diplomatic exchanges with American officials and in published news stories about the American imagery collection and analytical capabilities.

Using that data, the Indians apparently buried cables and technical equipment associated with nuclear tests at times when satellites were

not passing over the Indian test site, according to sources. As a diversion, the Indians apparently hinted about missile tests this week at another site in order to lead U.S. satellite coverage away from the nuclear testing area, the sources added.

Sen. Richard C. Shelby (R-Ala), chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, said after Tenet concluded his testimony that he still considered the CIA's silence a "colossal failure" but conceded that "the Indians had done a tremendous job in hiding what they were going to do."

Sen. Bob Kerrey (D-Neb.), the ranking Democrat on the committee, said he did not agree that the CIA had failed. "There are some things we simply may not be able to do," Kerrey said, adding that "we cannot rely strictly on satellites and must increase human intelligence."

Sen. John F. Kerry (D-Mass.),

said after leaving the hearing that he was "very satisfied" that U.S. intelligence was aware of Pakistan's activities. As a result of the Indian failure, Kerry added, "We will have significant notice if anyone tries to do something like that again."

Tenet, according to congressional sources, conceded that mistakes were on the basis of incomplete information. But the CIA director said he would await a report by an independent investigating panel appointed this week before deciding what steps are needed to prevent similar failures.

Tenet told the legislators that there were "shortfalls to be sure,"

one source said.

Tenet did warn his listeners that other events could be missed given all the areas of the world that require overhead satellite collection, including Bosnia, China, Russia, Iraq and Iran, as well as Pakistan and India. In defending the intelligence agencies, Tenet pointed out successes to which satellite collection had contributed, including negotiations with North Korea over nuclear materials.

Rep. Porter J. Goss (R-Fla.), chairman of the House panel, and Rep. Norman D. Dicks (D-Wash.), the ranking minority member, said after their briefing that leaks of

classified information had been harmful to the U.S. intelligence effort and that the House committee was planning to investigate that further.

Asked if "heads should roll" because of the intelligence failure, Goss said it was too early to tell. But he said that it appeared that policymakers were as responsible as intelligence collectors or analysts.

Goss stressed that human intelligence that could give guidance on the intentions of governments such as India must be boosted, an approach he took in recently adding money to the fiscal 1999 Intelligence Authorization Bill.

Law To Repeal Pakistani Arms Ban Is Proposed

New York Times

May 15, 1998

By Steven Lee Myers

WASHINGTON -- With the tacit blessing of the Clinton administration, two senators Thursday proposed repealing a law that has prohibited U.S. military assistance to Pakistan since 1990 as an incentive to Pakistan's government not to conduct an underground nuclear test.

The legislation by Sam Brownback, R-Kan., and Tom Harkin, D-Iowa, surfaced as a delegation dispatched by Presi-

dent Clinton headed for Pakistan to appeal for restraint following India's nuclear tests this week.

The law, known as the Pressler Amendment, has long caused a knotty dispute between the United States and Pakistan. It cut off all arms sales and military aid after the United States determined in 1990 that Pakistan possessed nuclear devices. Among other things, it scuttled the sale of 28 U.S. F-16 fighter jets for which Pakistan had already paid \$600

million.

The prospect of a repeal could give the delegation something to cite in its discussion with Pakistan's leaders. However, administration officials debated into Thursday evening as to whether -- and if so, how -- the delegation should raise it, an official said, speaking on condition of anonymity.

"There is a real dance on this one," the official said, noting that the delegation would have to be careful not to raise Pakistani expectations since it

could not guarantee how Congress would vote.

The proposed repeal did not come to a vote Thursday. Some senators argued that an easing of the ban might be premature. It is not expected to come up again until next week.

The Clinton administration did not take a public position on it, but an administration official said the White House had signaled support by calling it "an intriguing proposition" in talks with supporters of the repeal.

Washington Post

May 15, 1998

Pg. 33

China's Response To India Could Boost Its Reputation

By John Pomfret
Washington Post
Foreign Service

BEIJING, May 14—The explosion of five nuclear devices in India's forbidding Rajasthan desert has presented China for the second time in less than a year with a powerful opportunity to improve its international influence and reputation, Chinese and Western analysts say.

Of all the world's powers, India's huge northern neighbor, which Indian officials identified last week as its main threat, might be poised to best benefit from the fallout of New Delhi's decision to conduct nuclear tests in a bid to join the world's club of nuclear powers, these analysts say. India's actions give China an opportunity to

dispel impressions in the United States and the West that it poses a threat to the region, while proving that it is serious about its recent promises to stand against nuclear proliferation.

"China comes out a winner in this no matter what," said Bates Gill, a China security specialist at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, "but it could become an even greater winner if it is prepared to step up to the plate and accept some of the responsibilities of a great power."

The challenge for China is to resolve the paradox between its 50-year-old revolutionary rhetoric that no country should interfere in the internal affairs of another country and its two-year-old stated commitment, as a signatory to the Comprehen-

sive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, to oppose nuclear proliferation and halt nuclear tests. In addition, China's government must further resolve an impending battle between the country's powerful military-technical faction, which could use India's tests as a justification for supplying further nuclear equipment and expertise to India's arch-rival, Pakistan, and its internationalist wing, which has started arguing vociferously for a fundamental change in the way China deals with the world.

"This is a really interesting test case for China. It is going to be a signal to the rest of the world of how China is going to carry out the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the rest of its other security agreements," Gill said.

Just six months ago, China portrayed itself as the boy with his thumb in the dike, stemming the spread of Southeast Asia's financial crisis. China's \$1 bil-

lion loan to Thailand and its refusal to devalue its currency earned Beijing high marks in financial circles.

India's nuclear tests on Monday and Wednesday have thrown the region into a different type of crisis -- one of security, not economics. Coupled with the question of whether Pakistan will now stage its first nuclear test and with North Korea threatening today to resume its nuclear program, India's actions illustrate that Asia is fast becoming the focal point of global security issues.

But with reference to India and North Korea, China appears to be adopting a measured attitude, emphasizing its commitment to regional stability. In its first substantive comment since India's initial tests Monday, China said today that India showed "brazen contempt" for international efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and charged that its southern neighbor was

plotting to dominate South Asia. But consistent with its earlier restrained response, China made no retaliatory threats against India.

Instead, China attempted to portray itself as in the vanguard of efforts to stem nuclear proliferation. Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan spoke with Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright Wednesday night and urged the United States to work with China to press New Delhi to abandon its nuclear weapons program, state-run media reported. In addition, an influential Chinese scholar predicted that China also would be willing to pressure Pakistan, in concert with other countries, not to follow India's lead.

The response shows how far China has come since Mao Zedong's day, when Chinese revolutionaries called for the proliferation of nuclear weapons around the world to break what they called the U.S.-Soviet monopoly on weapons of mass destruction. Instead, China is increasingly acting like those traditional powers, eager to maintain its strategic advantage over nonnuclear powers while simultaneously improving its position among the nuclear states.

"We realize that nuclear proliferation is a great danger," said Shen Jiru, the author of a recent book, "China Won't Become Mr. No," that has become the standard of the internationalist faction within China's elite. In his book, Shen even advocates a military alliance among the world's five nuclear powers to ensure world stability, something that would have been taboo just a few months ago. "This indeed is an opportunity for us to show the world that we are a responsible power. . . . We have to begin to look at the world from a new perspective," he said in an interview. Shen predicted that China would not renege on the test ban treaty or the nonproliferation pact.

American and Chinese experts also predicted that India's actions could provide China with leverage in its relations with the United States. First, if China follows its own rhetoric and opposes nuclear proliferation, it would significantly weaken the position of those in

the United States who charge that China is a direct threat to American interests. Second, it could strengthen China's hand in negotiations with the United States to remove sanctions restricting the flow of American high technology to China. Beijing is specifically known to be seeking access to U.S. technology that allows simulated nuclear tests, in addition to nuclear weapons safety technology.

"China's adherence to the

[test ban treaty] and steadily improving behavior on nonproliferation may look pretty good to Americans by contrast with Indian arrogance and recklessness," said Chas Freeman, a former Defense Department official and expert on Chinese security issues, who added that India's tests could result in closer Sino-American ties.

U.S. analysts said signs that China was embracing a new role in international relations would be as follows: that China signals clearly that it is pre-

pared to exert what diplomatic pressure it can on New Delhi and pushes India as hard as it pushed North Korea to agree to work with the United States to end nuclear-weapons related work there; that China is prepared to back a strongly worded statement in the U.N. Security Council about India's tests; and that China is ready to attempt to deter Pakistan from exploding a nuclear device of its own.

New York Times

May 15, 1998

U.S. Neglect Of India Leads To Missed Signals

By Barbara Crossette

When the Soviet Union crumbled seven years ago, India -- a lumbering, unpredictable giant, some would say a troublesome one -- was cut adrift from old allies.

"The Indians got the worst of all possible worlds," said Stephen P. Cohen, director of the arms-control program at the University of Illinois and an expert on South Asian military and diplomatic affairs.

"They had been labeled as Soviet allies and they didn't have the Soviet Union around to help them any more," Cohen said in an interview. "They had lost contact with the United States, China was hostile, and Pakistan had the ability to make nuclear weapons."

India was eager for Western investment and ties, but felt the response from the United States could have been stronger. For one long period the United States was not even represented by an ambassador in New Delhi, and envoys came and went quickly.

Neglected no longer, India now presents Washington with its most serious diplomatic challenge. Not only has it opened up its region to the possibility of a nuclear arms race, but also to the possibility that the weapons just tested will be deployed and could be used one day.

"The Indian government has not shot itself in the foot -- it has most likely shot itself in the head," Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said this week. And this, he

said, despite "a small squadron of Cabinet officers" visiting India in recent months. Among them were Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Bill Richardson, U.S. representative at the United Nations.

Inevitably what went on at those meetings is now being widely re-examined, to determine whether the United States delivered a clear enough message to India about its opposition to nuclear testing, or whether India deliberately misled the Americans with assurances that no tests were planned.

The review is going on especially since warning signs were visible, former diplomats in the region and a range of U.S. experts say, dating back to 1996, when India tried to block the adoption of a worldwide Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and when the new government came into office seven weeks ago speaking positively of a nuclear policy.

In addition, Pakistani diplomats say that they told the U.S. government in recent weeks that nuclear tests were imminent in India.

In New Delhi in April, Richardson raised the topic of broadly improved relations but said the issue of nuclear testing had to be settled, with India forswearing nuclear testing. He was told by Defense Minister George Fernandes that India was in the process of a national defense review and that there was no nuclear testing being planned, Richardson's office said Thursday.

Richardson also told the Indians that the United States

appreciated its restraint.

Albright visited New Delhi last November and delivered the same message, but her trip was cut short by the crisis in Iraq.

The trips were meant to pave the way for a trip to India later this year by President Clinton, which would underline what a U.S. official described Thursday as a "recommitment to India" in the second Clinton administration.

Planners of the president's trip to India in the fall -- the first, if he makes it, of any U.S. president in 20 years -- saw the initiative either as a chance to press India to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, a giant trade mission or an opportunity to discuss common strategic concerns in Asia.

Gideon Rose, deputy director of national security studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, said the blame for what happened in India this week rests squarely on "foolish choices made by a right-wing government."

But he said that while "the general drift of U.S. policy was in the right direction, they didn't go far enough." "They didn't pay enough attention," he continued. "They didn't stroke the Indian sensitivities enough."

This week's tension represents a missed opportunity. In the 1990s, there was talk in New Delhi of a "strategic partnership with America," a phrase not uttered much since the 1960s.

Murli Deora, an opposition member of the Congress Party in the Indian Parliament, said in an interview Thursday that

those in India who watched relations between United States and India closely were surprised by what he calls the indifference of the Clinton administration.

"Those of us who have been to America, who like and support America, have felt for some years now, especially after Clinton taking over, that the U.S. administration is not giving as much attention to India," he said. "I have never seen a Democratic administration so lukewarm to India. We expected so much from Clinton. Deora recalled that Ambas-

sador Thomas Pickering, a popular envoy in New Delhi, was pulled out to become ambassador to Russia in 1993, after less than a year in India. It took the Clinton administration more than a year to replace him.

"This never happened before," he said. "The people of India have some self-respect."

In 1997, the administration replaced another popular and effective ambassador, Frank Wisner, who left for private industry, with former Ohio Gov. Richard Celeste. Except

for a stint as Peace Corps director, Celeste had no extended foreign experience.

Celeste, who is now back in Washington for consultations, had been away from New Delhi for several weeks because of the president of India's recent trip to the United States. A U.S. official said Thursday that the Indian Embassy has sent no warnings to Washington about impending nuclear tests.

Changing its policies, India had extended a friendly hand to Israel, after years of supporting radical Arab causes. It also reached out to the Association

of Southeast Asian Nations.

One of the recurring themes in Indian foreign policy has been the belief that given the opportunity, the United States would tilt toward Pakistan in a crisis. It has never looked that way from Pakistan, however.

When Clinton condemned India for its nuclear tests, some Pakistanis heard a second warning to them, not a friendly plea for restraint or a pat on the back for not having tested its nuclear arms. "Instead, we got a warning," a former Pakistani official said.

U.S., N. Korea revisit nuke deal

Pyongyang's threat to develop weapons makes meeting urgent

By Willis Witter
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

TOKYO — A senior U.S. diplomat arrived in South Korea yesterday to try to rescue a 1995 deal to freeze North Korea's nuclear weapons program and address Pyongyang's threats to reopen a mothballed nuclear reactor.

The diplomatic fallout from India's nuclear tests this week — including the likelihood of an imminent Pakistani test — enhanced the interest in the visit by Charles Kartman, a deputy assistant secretary of state.

"India has focused everyone's attention on the need to make this deal with North Korea work," one diplomat said.

Days before India exploded its first of five bombs Monday, North Korea's state-run news service exploded with unrelated threats of its own.

The Korean Central News Agency said a week ago that Pyongyang had nearly reached the "limit" of its "patience" because of the persistent "hostility" of the United States. The nuclear program may be restarted, it said, because the United States had not lived up to its part of the bargain.

Senior North Korean diplomats repeated those threats to The Washington Times at the United Nations on Wednesday, and again at the North Korean Embassy in Beijing yesterday.

Nearly four years ago, North Korea put its suspected nuclear weapons program in mothballs in exchange for a \$5 billion to \$6 billion deal in which the North would

get two reactors to generate electricity.

South Korea, with some help from Japan, agreed to pay the billions for the reactors. Washington pledged to come up with \$60 million a year for a half-million tons of heavy fuel oil to help the impoverished nation meet its energy needs until the first new reactor came on line.

The deal, administered by a newly established agency named the Korean Energy Development Organization (KEDO) has run relatively smoothly.

North Korea has kept its nuclear reactor under wraps and has sealed nearly all its spent fuel rods with bomb-making material, working under the eyes of international inspectors.

A nagging glitch since KEDO was established in 1995 has been the United States coming up with cash to keep its part of the bargain. Despite some opposition and budget cutbacks in Congress, Washington has managed to arrange delivery of the required 500,000 tons of oil in each of the past two years.

By the end of this month, Washington claims it will have sent 130,000 tons toward this year's allotment. But in the process it has left KEDO \$42 million in debt.

Mr. Kartman is expected to follow up on a request for funds from Seoul, first made by Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright during a recent visit.

But South Korean officials point to the Asian economic crisis that has brought soup kitchens to their once-prosperous capital and say they can do little more than pay

their share of the reactor cost — \$4 billion or more.

Some officials even express amazement that the United States, which is enjoying an economic boom, would dare to ask it for help in purchasing the oil.

"Our side has already paid a lot of money on the reactor side," a South Korean official said yesterday. "There's still a hesitancy to accept the American request for fuel oil."

Mr. Kartman will continue on next week to Tokyo, where the thought of helping to pay for North Korea's fuel oil is equally unpopular.

Two years ago, Japan made what its officials call a "bridge loan" of \$19 million to help KEDO buy oil to meet that year's quota. Japan is expected to pay more than \$1 billion for the reactors' construction costs.

Washington also has solicited cash for the oil from the European Union and nations such as Australia and Saudi Arabia, seeking to limit its own contribution to no more than half the \$60 million cost of the oil.

Lately those efforts have met with limited success.

The United States and other nations have also sent hundreds of millions of dollars of food aid to famine-racked North Korea over the past three years.

The two Koreas met formally with the United States and China twice recently with the goal of drafting a formal peace treaty to replace the 1953 Korean War armistice.

Washington
Times
May 15, 1998
Pg. 17

New York Times

May 15, 1998

U.S. Arms Embargo On Iran Has Loophole: Canada

By Anthony DePalma
with Lowell Bergman

VANCOUVER, British Columbia -- Several times over the past few years, Reza Akrami, an Iranian, left his home in the Vancouver area and flew to San Francisco to see a mysterious man who spoke in Persian and called himself Dr. Afshar.

They met at a swank hotel or an expensive restaurant. A few times they lunched on a private yacht docked in the bay. There were thick steaks and fine wines.

Eventually, a shadowy deal was put on the table. Dr. Afshar would arrange delivery of American-made jets and military parts, including electronics to guide anti-aircraft missiles. The destination for the parts was Iran, and the suggested payment was a large shipment of heroin, according to a fax sent from Iran to Akrami that outlined the arrangement.

The deal never came off. "Dr. Afshar" was an undercover agent for the United States Government posing as an arms dealer bent on evading the American embargo against Iran.

Akrami and an associate were arrested in Vancouver this week and are being held pending extradition to the United States. They face charges of conspiring to smuggle sophisticated military parts to Iran in violation of the United States embargo.

A joint investigation by The New York Times and CBS News has found that this is not an isolated case. A significant portion of the weapons that Iran buys illicitly move through Canada, taking advantage of regulatory loopholes and the Canadian Government's decision not to support the American embargo.

The result, say American officials and the Iranians involved, is a steady flow of American-made military parts across the border into Canada and on to Iran. "Sanctions against Iran make no sense because they get everything they want through other countries," Akrami said in an interview

here before his arrest.

According to an indictment returned this week by a grand jury in San Francisco, Akrami, 60, told undercover agents the Iranian Government wanted to buy as many klystron tubes -- the heart of missile guidance systems -- as he could find.

"There is a significant amount of circumvention of our sanctions through Canada," said Raymond Kelly, an Under Secretary of the United States Department of the Treasury, who is awaiting confirmation as the new head of the Customs Service. "Because of the relaxed border situation that we have with Canada, the potential for abuse there is greater than perhaps with other allies."

Among the Iranian arms deals involving Canada are these:

¶ A Long Island man was arrested last year by United States Customs agents as he tried to deliver engines and parts for F-14 Tomcat fighters to Iran; some of the items were to be routed through Canada. He is awaiting trial.

¶ A Canadian businessman was indicted in Washington, D.C., last year on 27 counts of shipping embargoed aviation parts to Iran by way of Canada and then Germany. He is currently a fugitive.

¶ In Miami in 1994, an Irish businessman pleaded guilty to charges of attempting to send military night-vision goggles to Iran by way of Canada.

And Iran is not the only destination for embargoed American military equipment from Canada.

Several Americans and Canadians were arrested last August and charged with attempting to sell to Iraq 35 American-made military helicopters that Canada had declared surplus. The buyers had asked that some helicopters be outfitted with chemical-spraying equipment. Two Canadians have already pleaded guilty; the other defendants are awaiting trial.

Last fall a Toronto businessman pleaded guilty to selling \$6 million worth of jet parts, including some that could

have military uses, to Libya.

"I'll be honest with you: Canada does not pretend that it is enforcing a U.S. embargo," said Lynda E. Watson, director of the export controls division in the Canadian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. While Canada tries to make sure it is not used as a decoy to get around American export restrictions, she explained, its efforts are limited.

"It's not our embargo," she said, "and it's not our job to enforce a U.S. embargo."

The Middleman: From Army Doctor to Refugee

There are many unanswered questions about Akrami: Precisely on whose behalf was he shopping for parts? What did the Iranian Government know about his activities?

And while American agents were luring him into their sting, Canadian intelligence agents were using him as their informant.

Akrami said in an interview before his arrest that he was merely a purchasing agent for Iran. "I cannot stop them to fax me what they want," he said, "but it doesn't mean I can do something or I want to do something."

Akrami's lawyer, Irvine E. Epstein, said his client had exaggerated the importance of his contacts in Iran and expected Dr. Afshar to arrange the export permits if the deals went through.

"He's absolutely adamant that he has not committed any crimes in Canada or the United States," Epstein said of his client. "If anything, what we have is perhaps some overzealous undercover agents trying to make something out of nothing."

Before coming to Canada, Akrami said, he was a colonel in the Iranian Army and a cardiac surgeon in contact with many of Iran's most powerful people. He boasted to friends that he had once treated the Ayatollah Khomeini.

Akrami said he had received his medical degrees in Germany and returned to Iran just a year

before the 1979 revolution. His foreign training made him suspect in the turmoil of fundamentalist, post-revolution Iran. He was imprisoned but was allowed to see patients, he said.

Soon after being freed from prison, Akrami married an Iranian woman with family in Vancouver. In 1991 he emigrated to Canada, where he quickly fit into Vancouver's substantial Iranian refugee community.

"I'm connected to everybody," he said during the interview at his office.

He does not practice medicine in Canada but gained notoriety when his mother-in-law won a divorce settlement that was the equivalent of \$12 million, one of the largest in Canadian history. He helped her invest the money in various ventures, and made no secret of his intention to do business with Iran.

In the interviews, he said he helped arrange for the delivery of two shiploads of American chemicals to Iran about four years ago, which he believed did not violate terms of the embargo. He also said he regularly received faxed messages from Iran requesting help in purchasing everything from Braille typewriters and spare parts for jumbo jets to a fleet of used civilian aircraft.

People close to the investigation said he once told undercover agents, "Canada is Iran's free-trade zone."

The United States first imposed economic sanctions on Iran after the hostage crisis in 1979. In 1995, after Iran was linked to terrorist attacks, a total ban was imposed on all American trade with the country. Before then, certain items, including some chemicals, could be exported from the United States.

The Introductions: Linking Heroin to Fighter Jets

Akrami might not have come to the attention of American authorities if not for another Iranian immigrant to Canada who was arrested by drug agents in San Francisco in 1994 and charged with a conspiracy to distribute large amounts of heroin.

Prosecutors in San Francisco had substantial evidence against the man, Abraham

Hamidi. But after he developed medical problems they let him return to his home in Langley, a Vancouver suburb where he lived in a modest house and grew Iranian sour plums in the backyard.

Shortly after his return to Canada, Hamidi held a dinner at his home and invited a young Iranian friend, Mohsen Lessan, and Akrami, who said he was looking for new business opportunities.

But this was apparently more than a social engagement. According to officials familiar with the investigation, Hamidi was cooperating with American agents who wanted to broaden their investigation into the Iranian heroin connection. The charges against Hamidi in California were dismissed in April 1996, but within a few days he was arrested on a similar drug charge in Canada. In an unusual move, the records in that case were sealed, and it is not possible to learn its outcome.

Lessan, now a 30-year-old real estate salesman in Vancouver, said in an interview that he and Akrami had flown to San Francisco and met the man they knew as Dr. Afshar. They lunched in grand style on a yacht they believed was his. They discussed the purchase of up to 30 used jets for Iran, as well as parts and other items.

Lessan said he felt he was in over his head. While Akrami returned to San Francisco at least twice, Lessan never again met Dr. Afshar. He was arrested this week along with

Akrami and is being held pending extradition to San Francisco, where a United States Attorney, Michael J. Yamaguchi, plans to prosecute him and Akrami on the conspiracy charges.

Lessan's lawyer, Jamie Paez, has refused to comment.

The End of the Deal: A Disputed Fax, an Angry Ex-Wife

In his first interview with The New York Times and CBS, Akrami denied knowing Hamidi. But at a subsequent talk in his high-rise apartment, he admitted that he had gone to Hamidi's house, but only because his wife liked the sour plums that Hamidi grew.

Hamidi did not respond to several phone calls or visits to his home.

Akrami eventually admitted he had discussed several deals with "Dr. Afshar," adding, "Ninety-nine percent of the discussion was about planes."

But he said one fax he received from his contact in Iran - a man known as Sultanapur who has been linked to the Iranian Government -- requested sophisticated military parts, including the American-made klystron tubes used for missile guidance systems.

At the meetings in San Francisco, which were monitored by United States agents, Akrami openly discussed military parts and displayed a detailed knowledge of how they worked. Once, he even commented that the suitcase-sized klystron tube the agents had

brought was a slightly different color than those he had seen before.

During this period, officials said, Akrami also met regularly with the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, Canada's spy agency, which sometimes uses recent immigrants to gather information. He insists he never told them about the San Francisco meetings.

Akrami acknowledged there were other faxes as well, including one that mentioned paying for the parts with a "shipload of heroin." But he insisted that although he presented the faxed letter to Dr. Afshar, he never had any intention of actually going through with the deal.

"This was nonsense," said Akrami. "How can I have drugs to offer to someone for something like that?"

After repeated contact and telephone conversations with the undercover agents, Akrami abruptly backed away from the deal last summer. He said things had changed because of the tightened American embargo and because of the more moderate Government that had come to power in Iran's elections. But there appeared to be another reason: his recently divorced wife, who had some of the faxes from Iran, was threatening to expose him.

He said his former wife had shown the faxes to authorities in an attempt to discredit him. People close to the investigation confirmed that the Canadian Security Intelligence

Service, a local prosecutor and a member of Parliament had talked to the woman.

The Loophole An 'Exception' for a Neighbor

Although Akrami is not charged with actually shipping any embargoed parts to Iran, recent incidents indicate that plenty of American military goods leave Canada's shores, largely because of "the Canada exemption."

For decades it has been policy of both Canada and the United States that Canada would purchase major arms systems from the United States instead of developing its own military industry. For this reason, such goods being shipped to Canada are exempt from the licensing requirements that apply to every other country.

"Since we don't issue a license here, there's no trail to follow," said John Hensley, former head of enforcement for the United States Customs Service. "Therefore we can't tell how much is leaving Canada en route to other countries."

Canada does \$1 billion a year in legitimate trade with Iran. While Canada has regulations to keep Canada from being used to hide shipments to Iran, officials here make it clear that the embargo is America's fight, not Canada's.

"We feel that we are taking very responsible and strong steps to deal with this," said Ms. Watson, the Canadian customs official, "but we're not 100 percent effective."

South Asian arms race raises specter of nuclear exchange

Indian test blasts follow Pakistan's surprise missile launch

By Bill Gertz
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

India's recent nuclear tests and Pakistan's firing of a new medium-range missile have created fears of a nuclear war in South Asia.

This week's five detonations show that India has a range of deployment options under review for countering threats it perceives from China and Pakistan, defense

analysts said yesterday.

Pakistan, which U.S. officials say could respond soon with its first underground nuclear test, surprised the world in April by test launching a new missile called the Ghauri with a range of 925 miles.

Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said recent events in the region are worrisome.

"Any development of a nuclear

weapon by India or Pakistan is going to increase the arms race," Mr. Bacon said. "We believe this will make the area less stable rather than more stable, less peaceful rather than more peaceful."

A Pentagon report several years ago described the tensions between India and Pakistan as a potential flashpoint. "In terms of international security, the presence

Washington
Times
May 15, 1998
Pg. 14

of nuclear and missile programs in India and Pakistan raises the sobering prospect that the first nuclear war between two developing states may well be fought on this subcontinent," it said.

The Clinton administration sent a high-level delegation, including the commander of U.S. forces in the region, Marine Corps Gen. Anthony Zinni, to Islamabad on Wednesday to head off a possible Pakistani underground nuclear test in response to the Indian tests.

According to U.S. officials and outside experts, India's five nuclear tests varied in size from smaller-size devices to missile-warhead-size blasts, including possibly a huge thermonuclear explosion.

"That could be for all the devices they want to deploy — from battlefield weapons to missile warheads," said Henry Sokolski, director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center. "It could be the constellation of their nuclear forces is captured by these tests."

Based on the data from the blasts, the Indians could then build

bigger or better nuclear arms, he said, using supercomputers purchased from the West.

The Center for Defense Information (CDI) estimates that India could have more than 60 strategic nuclear weapons, which eventually could be delivered on either of two missiles, the Prithvi with a range of 155 miles or the Agni with a range of 1,550 miles. The Agni was flight-tested in 1993 but is still in development.

The Indian weapons also could be delivered on Russian MiG-27 and French Jaguar aircraft.

Pakistan itself could have between 15 and 25 nuclear weapons, according to CDI, and the Ghauri is one of several missiles that could be used to deliver them, along with some of its U.S.-made F-16 jets.

The Ghauri was developed with help from North Korea, and China also sold M-11 missiles and helped Islamabad develop its own Haft-1 and Haft-2 missiles.

"It looks like what the Indians are doing is developing a warhead for the Agni missile," said former CIA Director R. James Woolsey.

"The fact that some tests were smaller and another was thermonuclear suggests their program is in a pretty high state of sophistication."

Pakistan's nuclear program has relied heavily on China, Mr. Woolsey said in an interview. "The question there is how far have the Chinese got them along," he said.

The Pakistani nuclear program probably is oriented toward aircraft delivery "with or without a test program," Mr. Woolsey said. He said it is not yet clear whether Pakistan could deliver a nuclear warhead on the Ghauri.

China has as many as 434 strategic and tactical nuclear weapons that could be delivered on a variety of long-, medium- and short-range missiles, as well as aircraft, according to CDI.

China is developing a new mobile intermediate-range missile that will be deployed in areas close to India, according to U.S. intelligence reports.

European Stars & Stripes

May 15, 1998

Pg. 1

Standing Up For Freedom

Clinton, veterans remember airlift

By Marion Callahan and
Marni McEntee, Staff Writers

BERLIN — Mercedes Wild stood trembling at Tempelhof Airport on Thursday morning, clenching the hand of the man who changed her life.

She remembers her childhood hero as Uncle Chocolate. Most know him as Gail Halvorsen, the Air Force pilot who started an operation that showered 23 tons of candy, using parachutes made from handkerchiefs, onto the western parts of the city during the life-saving Berlin Airlift of 1948-1949.

Yet the scattered packages drifting in the wind never made their way to Wild, who was then a 7-year-old girl, surviving on just one hot meal a day. So she wrote a letter, asking Halvorsen to drop candy in a garden and the chicken pen behind her home.

"Don't worry if the chickens lose their feathers," she remembers writing. He responded with a letter, which, to this day, she keeps in a secret place. Under the wing of a vintage C-54 cargo plane, Wild

and Halvorsen reunited Thursday to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Berlin Airlift and rekindle their decades-old friendship.

They were joined by President Clinton and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl to honor the 77-year-old Halvorsen and the thousands of veterans who made the Berlin Airlift a success.

Like Wild and Halvorsen's friendship, Clinton said, "The airlift became a sharing of the soul, a story that tells people never to give up, never to lose faith. We learned freedom is worth standing up for."

Halvorsen spoke about the airlift, recalling the children's pleas. He said the children, watching through the fence at the edge of the runway, weren't begging for food. "They wanted their freedom," he said. The airlift, known by the men who flew it as Operation Vittles, began June 26, 1948, on orders from President Truman after the Soviets blocked all train and road traffic and cut electricity to the western part of Berlin. The 2 million inhabitants of that area were under

the administrative control of the United States, France and Britain. Moscow was trying to force the Western powers to abandon their enclaves 110 miles inside the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany.

In all, the Western allies made more than 277,000 flights in round-the-clock deliveries of more than 2.3 million tons of food, fuel and medicine to Berlin. At the peak of the airlift, aircraft were taking off and landing about every minute. On May 12, 1949, the Soviets ended the blockade. The rescue effort claimed the lives of 78 airmen, including 31 Americans. Thursday's event was an opportunity for people from both countries to remember how so many thousands took to heart Truman's declaration that the choked-off city would not stand alone.

During a speech, Clinton reminded the crowd:

"On June 28, 1948, in a small meeting in the White House, President Harry Truman said: 'There is no discussion on that point. We stay in Berlin, period.'"

An estimated 8,000 people gathered Thursday morning in the airport bleachers to celebrate. The C-54 Skymaster sat nose to nose with the United

States' most advanced cargo airplane, a C-17A Globemaster III. Mock CARE packages lined a riser near the C-54, and ramps lined with German and American flags led visitors into the plane's belly. Green duffel bags filled with coal and sacks of flour were lashed down like they were 50 years ago before an army of Germans unloaded the supplies onto the needy German soil.

As the two heads of state spoke at Tempelhof, two columns of U.S. airmen who volunteered to attend the ceremony stood rigid at attention. Beside them was the band of the U.S. Air Force in Europe, which played the national anthems of both countries. A jazzy German Bundeswehr big band added 1940s favorites like *In The Mood* and *Don't Sit Under The Apple Tree (With Anyone Else But Me)*.

Clinton and Kohl later ripped down a banner to christen the Globemaster *The Spirit of Berlin*, in honor of the anniversary. The leaders then presented the banner to Halvorsen.

Air Force Capt. Erik Hansen of the 14th Airlift Squadron flew the commemorative C-17 from Charleston Air Force Base, S.C. He wasn't part of the Berlin Airlift, but he clearly

remembers the aftermath. He was born in Berlin and attended school in the divided city during the early days of the Cold War.

"It seemed to be such a tragedy to see the city divided with friends and families separated," Hansen said. "But now it is one city. It just shows you what can become of one simple act of kindness. I'm just thrilled now to be a part of it."

Hundreds of soldiers and airmen also took part in the preparations and the celebrations. High in the bleachers, the blue caps of a small contingent from Charleston Air Force Base were visible from the tarmac. Six airmen had been chosen from among 30 who wrote an essay on why they decided to serve in the Air Force. The winners were flown

to Berlin.

"Usually we're living in tents out there and doing the backbone work," said Airman 1st Class Chad Rood, 21, of Flint, Mich. "Here we're taking part in a historical event. It's the continuation of something that we (the Air Force) started 50 years ago."

After the ceremony, Clinton reached his hand over the fence, which separated viewers from the airfield, to personally thank Ken Herman, who flew more than 190 trips to Berlin during the airlift. Herman has been the president of the Berlin Airlift Veterans Association ever since it was formed. He travels to Berlin every five years to meet with veterans who participated in the airlift.

(Contributing to this report: The Associated Press)

Defense Cleanup May 15, 1998 Pg. 3

BRAC Savings Depend On Cleanup

The rising price tag of closing of military bases and its affects on the rest of the military construction budget rely heavily on finishing cleanup and the disposing of the property. "The real savings come from the closure of the bases and getting the workers off the roles," Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Jimmy Dishner told the Senate Appropriations military construction subcommittee.

Sen. Conrad Burns, R-Mont., said this issue has become increasingly important in lieu of Defense Secretary Wil-

liam Cohen's plea to Congress to approve two more Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) rounds (Defense Cleanup, 4/10).

"It's important because we are trying to find ways to stretch the budget," Burns told Dishner and Assistant Secretary of the Army Paul Johnson during the hearing.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Robert Pirie, said the agency is absolutely committed to cleanup but cautioned that the success hinges on stable funding, a key component to the disposal strategy.

The Defense Dept. requested \$857 million for BRAC environmental cleanup in fiscal year 1999.

Defense Information & Electronics Report

May 15, 1998

Pg. 1

Officials want 'snapshot' of policy improvements

Clinton Administration Plans To Reconvene Joint Security Commission

The Clinton administration plans to reconvene an independent panel to determine how much progress has been made in the last four years toward overhauling the federal government's security policies, practices and procedures.

Defense Information and Electronics Report has learned that Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre and Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet want the Joint Security Commission put back in business for 60 to 90 days, enough time to

produce a "snapshot" of the security policy landscape, sources say.

The idea, according to sources familiar with the move, is to assess how well the U.S. Security Policy Board has done in implementing the numerous recommendations the Joint Security Commission (JSC) made in its February 1994 report, "Redefining Security."

Pentagon spokeswoman Susan Hansen said the decision to reconvene the JSC was made at the most recent meeting of the SPB. That session, held in early April, was the first gathering of the top-level board in more than two years.

The SPB is chaired by Hamre and Tenet, who, observers say, have been concerned that too little progress

has been made in changing the way the national security community and other sectors of government handle thorny issues like personnel, physical, and information security.

Indeed, an e-mail message written by an SPB staffer following the April 2 SPB meeting notes that there hasn't been a lot of headway made, particularly in the area of reciprocity. In security policy, reciprocity involves the use of a common set of rules.

"There was a lot of sentiment from the senior people sitting at the table that the security community has not fixed a lot of things for real and that reciprocity is a phantom," the e-mail message reads. "Obviously, with this as a mandate it is time to do something about it."

Minutes from a recent meeting of the Security Policy Advisory Board, a panel that monitors the SPB, also affirms the rebirth of the JSC. Following a discussion of how well the SPB has done in recrafting security policy—"forward movement is slow but real," the document notes—the minutes from the March 26 meeting state "To that end, the Joint Security Commission will reconvene shortly to evaluate the status of the implementation of

its original recommendations."

At press time, it was uncertain just when the JSC would be stood up again. It is clear, however, that Jeffrey Smith, former CIA general counsel, will not serve a second stint as JSC chairman. Smith, an attorney now in private practice, reportedly has taken himself out of contention for a return to the post. Sources say some of his private sector clients are information security companies, which he believes would create a conflict of interest if he were to be on the JSC.

The JSC's lengthy report, delivered to then-Defense Secretary William Perry and former DCI James Woolsey, was a groundbreaking effort. The 157-page report made numerous reform proposals, covering classification management, personnel security, information systems security, and advanced technology protection.

The JSC also called for the creation of the SPB, a recommendation that President Clinton put into action six months after the commission's report was completed. According to the commission, the SPB was to unify security policy development by eliminating the fragmented system that existed. In short, the SPB would put in place the recommendations made by the commission, and make numerous other reforms as well. As is often the case, making

recommendations and implementing them are two very different things. In March 1997, the Commission on Protecting and Reducing Government Secrecy had harsh words for the SPB, noting that the board had failed to make "meaningful progress" on major issues, like putting key elements of the JSC's report into action.

The SPB has its defenders, however. The board's staff director, Dan Jacobson, told *DIER* in an interview last December that the SPB is a "tremendous success story." The board has been able to pull together numerous agencies and departments -- 35 at last count—that rarely talked together about security policy, Jacobson said. As for the JSC's recommendations? "I think we've wrapped up a hell of a lot of them," he said. "We're a lot closer than most people think."

But at the March 26 SPB meeting, Jacobson acknowledged the board is not all that close on some major issues. According to the meeting minutes, the National Intelligence Council has made the compilation of threat data a priority matter. Indeed, the JSC had called for DOD and the CIA to collect threat data in a central location so it would be more readily available to develop countermeasures. "Mr. Jacob-

son replied that, unfortunately, this did not occur and this issue must remain a priority," the minutes read.

North Korea will return remains believed to be those of two American soldiers killed in the Korean War, the American-led U.N. Command said yesterday. The remains, to be handed over today, are the latest to be returned since North Korea began repatriating bodies in 1990. The United States was given access to the North in 1996 to search for remains.

Philadelphia
Inquirer
May 15, 1998
Pg. 4

Defense Daily May 15, 1998 Pg. 3

Senate Cuts Funds For THAAD, AMRAAM

By Sheila Foote

The Senate yesterday agreed to cut the FY '99 funding authorization for the Army's THAAD missile defense program by \$253.9 million.

The Senate by voice vote approved the cut, proposed by Senate Armed Services Committee (SASC) Chairman Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) and Ranking Member Carl Levin (D-Mich.), as it began debate on the FY '99 Defense Authorization Bill (S. 2057).

As part of the same amendment, the Senate cut \$21 million from the procurement authorization for the Air Force's Advanced Medium Air-to-Air Missile program, built by Raytheon [RTNA/RTNB]. The Air Force had requested \$62.6 million to build 115 missiles.

The Senate used the funds cut from THAAD and AMRAAM to increase the amount authorized for classified programs by \$275 million.

The cut eliminates the rest of the money authorized in FY '99 to begin a contract with Lockheed Martin [LMT] for the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) portion of the program. SASC had already cut \$70 million from the THAAD EMD authorization from the bill.

"Because of the failure of the test, the monies can't be expended," Strategic Forces Subcommittee Chairman Robert Smith (R-N.H.) told *Defense Daily*. Smith was referring to THAAD's fifth consecutive failure in a flight test Tuesday.

Smith said the panel still supports the program, which is intended to provide wide area defenses for U.S. troops fighting wars abroad. The cut "is not directed as some kind of retribution for failure," he said.

In report language accompanying its bill, which was written before the latest test failure, SASC says "the committee continues to support the development, production and fielding of THAAD as a matter of highest priority, including early fielding of the User Operational Evaluation System."

The committee, however, mandates that the DoD not obligate funds to buy THAAD UOES missiles until the secretary of defense certifies that THAAD has completed a successful intercept flight test and that this test demonstrates the program is ready to enter production.

DoD had requested a total of \$821.6 million for THAAD in FY '99, \$497.7 million of which was for demonstration/validation and \$323.9 million of which was for EMD.

The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization has said it will require three successful THAAD missile intercepts before entering the EMD phase. THAAD has not yet achieved a successful intercept.

Philadelphia Inquirer

May 15, 1998

Pg. 12

Army promotion rate to colonel for blacks is half that for whites in '98

There is "extreme concern" in the Pentagon, a spokesman said. A study has been ordered.

By Susanne M. Schafer
ASSOCIATED PRESS

WASHINGTON — The Army's promotion rate to colonel for white officers this year was about double that of blacks, a matter of "extreme concern" to Pentagon leaders, Defense Department spokesman Kenneth Bacon said yesterday.

A lengthy study has been ordered of the files of all individuals concerned "to see if there were any differences in their assignments, their training, their mentoring ... that could explain this difference," the spokesman said.

The promotion list, which came out in February, is the Army's pick of officers for its leadership positions, and the group from which

generals will later be chosen.

Bacon did not have figures to offer for comparison with previous years, but he said there "was a much greater ... difference than has occurred in the past, in the recent past. So that's one of the reasons it stood out so dramatically."

A preliminary look at the promotion system did not find any racial bias among those who took part in the board that chose the officers for promotion, Bacon said.

The process involves a highly confidential system in which an officer's records are used to judge candidates for promotion. The records include an official photo in uniform, the officer's list of assignments, evaluations, qualifications

and educational history.

"We regarded this as an aberration in a military that works very hard to provide absolutely equal opportunity to everybody," Bacon said. "We regard it clearly as a matter of great concern, and it's one that we're working very hard, one, to understand, and two, to correct."

The spokesman said that no changes would be made in the list. The review was undertaken, he said, "to make sure that there's not a pattern that begins very early in a soldier's career that might deny people of some race the command opportunities or career opportunities that would be necessary conditions for their promotion."

Bacon said: "The goal is equal opportunity. But to have equal opportunity, you have to have it at every stage of the career. And what we

want to make sure is that that, in fact, exists."

"If we find ... it is a question of changing assignments, if it's a question of changing training, if it's a question of the types of specialties that people go into and leads them more quickly to dead ends later in their career, we want to make sure that we understand what's happening and try to correct it," Bacon said.

For 1996, the last year for which figures were available, the Army had 9,293 black officers, or about 11.5 percent of the total. Blacks made up about 30 percent, or 122,600 soldiers, in the enlisted ranks that same year.

Washington Times

May 15, 1998

Pg. 18

Taiwan tests defenses, feeling a nuclear chill

TAITUNG, Taiwan — The Nationalist Chinese ended four days of war games yesterday to test their defenses against the growing capabilities of their communist archrivals on the mainland.

The last drill was held near Hualien. With naval support, hundreds of soldiers and armored vehicles playing the part of invaders landed on an eastern beach near Chihsingtang.

The east used to get less attention as the military concentrated on the west coast, facing China.

But that has changed as Beijing acquires advanced aircraft and increases its submarine activity east of Taiwan.

The military played down the exercise, code-named Han Kuang 14 (Han Glory), calling it routine training that should not be linked to other matters.

India's surprise nuclear tests rang alarms in Taiwan, which scrapped its own advanced nuclear-weapons program a decade ago under U.S. pressure. Now it worries a new Chinese-Indian arms race may undermine American support for its security.

Washington Times

May 15, 1998

Pg. 3

Air Force memorial challenged

Marine monument foes say Arlington site picked illegally

By Joyce Howard Price
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Plaintiffs in a lawsuit that seeks to stop construction of a proposed Air Force memorial on grounds near the Marine Corps' Iwo Jima Memorial charge that the process involved in selecting the site was illegal.

The plaintiffs, Rep. Gerald B.H. Solomon, chairman of the House Rules Committee and a former Marine, and a group that calls itself Friends of Iwo Jima, argue that site-approval decisions for the Air Force memorial by the National Capital Planning Commission, the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Park Service were all "unlawful, and each must be set aside."

"The [selection] process was manipulated behind the scenes to the detriment of the Iwo Jima Memorial," Edward Timperlake, a former assistant secretary for the Department of Veterans Affairs who is now an aide for the House Rules Committee, said in an interview yesterday.

Mr. Timperlake made his comments as he discussed a legal brief to be filed today in U.S. District Court in Alexandria. In the suit, the plaintiffs ask that a permanent injunction be issued to bar construction of a proposed ultra-modern 50-foot-high aluminum and concrete structure near the huge bronze memorial that commemorates Marines raising the

U.S. flag at Iwo Jima on Feb. 23, 1945.

The Marine Corps has said it opposes the Air Force memorial, which is to be built 500 feet beyond the perimeter of the Iwo Jima monument, behind a grove of mature trees in an area known as Arlington Ridge.

Mr. Solomon, New York Republican, and others opposing plans to erect a modern monument, complete with a 20,000-square-foot underground museum, accuse the government defendants in their suit of violating a 1986 federal statute known as the Commemorative Works Act, or CWA, in approving Arlington Ridge as the site for the Air Force Memorial.

In their brief, the plaintiffs say the CWA "prohibits a 'commemorative work' from interfering with an existing work."

The plaintiffs cite four reasons why construction of the Air Force Memorial at Arlington Ridge should be blocked:

- They say the Air Force Memorial "does not fit within the CWA's definition of a commemorative work because its proposed 20,000-square-foot 'reception and exhibition visitor center' does not meet the CWA's definition.

- They say the National Capital Planning Commission "failed to follow its own procedures in approving the location of Arlington Ridge" as the site for the memorial.

- They say the government agencies gave "insufficient notice to the public" before they approved the site.

- They charge that the Air Force Memorial "encroaches upon and interferes with the Iwo Jima Memorial and the Netherlands Carillon and does not protect, to the maximum extent practicable, open space and existing public use of Arlington Ridge."

The plaintiffs' brief describes "exhaustive lobbying" by Lt. Gen. Robert D. Springer, former executive director of the Air Force Memorial Foundation, to get the National Capital Planning Commission to overturn its October 1994 rejection of Arlington Ridge as the Air Force Memorial site. Six months later, this aggressive lobbying led to the NCPC's "unprecedented reversal" of its earlier decision, the brief contends.

"It is a sad commentary that a federal agency can be manipulated in the way General Springer did the NCPC," the plaintiffs say in the brief.

The brief cites an affidavit by Edward Grandis, a former NCPC commissioner, who says another NCPC commissioner, Jack Finberg, told him he initiated a vote to reconsider the earlier site rejection because he had a "knife in his back." Mr. Finberg previously had opposed building the Air Force Memorial at Arlington Ridge.

Test Time For Pakistan

IN THE RACE to keep Pakistan from following India into nuclear testing, the United States has three options that need to be bound into a coherent policy.

The first is to contain the damage. By whatever persuasion and arm-twisting it takes, American officials should try to ensure that new testing does not lead on to deployment. A higher position on the nuclear ladder for one or both the South Asian countries should not moot the obligation of restraint. India may be hard to reach: Its pride is high, and as a nation that lives with mass poverty, it will not yield easily even to punishing sanctions. But there are degrees of harm from the testing, and the lesser degrees are better.

Then, the United States and others must refocus on the security requirements of Pakistan. The Indian tests have made the Pakistanis, already feeling vulnerable, feel doubly so. The team President Clinton dispatched to Islamabad to argue abstinence from testing will surely be asked how the administration intends to ex-

tend protection. Part of the answer is by immediate release of the American warplanes that Pakistan bought and paid for but was not allowed to take possession of because of its own lesser nuclear proclivities. Another part is to show the Pakistanis, by imposing severe sanctions on India, what they might suffer from their own renewed testing. A further part lies in the hands of China, which in this instance stands closer to American policy than does friendly, democratic India. China is the strategic patron of Pakistan and the technical enabler of its testing capability.

Finally, the whole disarmament cause must be revived in pace and scope to match the newly demonstrated urgency. The declared nuclear countries have far to go to be able to lead by example rather than by exhortation. This was the explicit condition of the nuclear privilege granted the United States and the other declared powers in the basic nonproliferation treaty.

The test ban treaty's lack of enforcement provisions is painfully evident. Still, its value in setting nuclear standards remains. The treaty does not come formally into effect until India and at least 39 other nations with civilian nuclear power accept it. The U.S. Senate, which has been sitting on this treaty, should ratify it now.

Testing India

By James H. McNally

A surprise result of the resumption of Indian nuclear testing is the seeming surprise expressed by various administration officials as well as the press. The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) has made no secret of its interest in the nuclear testing option in public writings. From their first nuclear explosion in 1974, the Indian government is also well aware of precedents for emotional world condemnation and accompanying very mild slaps from the international community. More

recently, the present state of United States confusion and lack of leadership regarding responses to Iraqi and Iranian activities is clear to all and can be seen as presenting little threat to Indian activities.

Interest in Indian nuclear explosion capabilities extends back to Nehru himself, as I quickly found out while preparing to visit our embassy in New Delhi as a "bomb expert" in 1974 during the Kissinger-Gandhi discussions. The Indians were proud of the nuclear infrastructure they had established even then.

The United States may well have enabled, if not indirectly encouraged, the recent Indian test. Beyond U.S. inattention and lack of a meaningful long-term policy regarding Indian nuclear interests, the United States is seen by India as arrogant

and self-serving in the pursuit of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) negotiations and a final draft treaty. We provided inadvertent support for BJP rhetoric supporting nuclear explosive capabilities. Circumventing Indian interests and objections in our eagerness to open a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty provided Indian politicians and technical people with a rallying point. The nuclear tests are one of the first of the new BJP-led government actions.

As has often been stated, there are many of us technicians unable to find any technical advantage to forgoing the realities of testing, if the United States is to have nuclear weapons as any part of its national security policy. To us it is difficult to understand the sweeping asserted political advantages of a CTBT, particularly when the act of bringing the CTBT into being may have eased the way for Indian (and possibly Pakistani) nuclear testing.

Washington
Times
May 15, 1998
Pg. 23

James H. McNally was deputy assistant director for Verification and Intelligence of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency from 1986 to 1988.

New York Times May 15, 1998

On My Mind / By A.M. Rosenthal

The Shout From India

The decision was made by India, and India will pay the economic price. But Americans should understand that it was the West, particularly the U.S., that built the policy road leading to the Indian underground explosions.

The utter shock in Washington shows more than an intelligence failure. It shows attitudes about India are the same Western mush of arrogance, ignorance and condescension that they have been for the half-century since Indian independ-

ence.

Just as plainly it shows the danger of the new ingredient President Clinton added -- the drive to make China the partner of America in the last years of this century and all the next, partner in trade, technology, honing the capabilities of Chinese armed forces, and in security strategy that will affect all Asia and the Pacific.

Think of yourself as Indian for a few paragraphs -- not a Gandhi Indian, few of those

left, but just Indian, one of the millions who delightedly approve of the nuclear tests that put such a startled face on Washington.

Look around. Pakistan on the border, created by the 1947 partition, is almost entirely Muslim, about 132 million. India has about 850 million Hindus and 120 million Muslims. India has been basically democratic since independence, and Pakistan basically authoritarian.

Since partition, three wars have been fought between them. Another is possible any time -- over India's possession of Muslim Kashmir, or religious massacres in either country, or suspicion so deep they bleed for it.

Both have nuclear-weapon capacity and never submitted to no-testing demands from nuclear powers finished with all the tests they needed.

Washington lectures us: Parity should exist between India and Pakistan. Are we fools? Parity between our billion and their 132 million, our huge scientific establishment and their puny one, our democracy and their authoritarianism?

We have a larger army, but these Pakistanis fight like hell. We can defeat them in conventional war -- if only their ally China does not charge in to help them.

And this is the nerve-racking part -- China sells nuclear technology and missile know-how to Pakistan. The U.S. does not

penalize China. We like that as Americans would like Mexico getting military parity with the U.S. plus nuclear stuff from Russia.

China sliced up our army in 1962 and took a chunk of our Himalayan border land. China won't give it back. Indian intelligence takes fewer daily naps than American, but are we sure China can never surprise us again and that if it were losing it would never ever use nukes? Our Socialist Defense Minister says China is our most dangerous opponent.

But listen to Mr. Clinton talk of his priority -- American

democracy and Chinese dictatorship knitting together in trade and security strategy. What strategy? Was India consulted, even thought about?

I lived four years in India as a correspondent. Washington's policy was a little pat on the head, or a scolding finger -- and still is.

I wish the tests had not been made. They will burden India's economy -- more arms, few foreign loans, less investment, much denunciation.

The nationalist party heading the coalition Government runs counter to my hopes for India. It is xenophobic about

foreign investment, has a history of Muslim-baiting and maintains extremist Hindu branches, including one headed by a Bombay nasty who admires Hitler.

Indians say that as a member of a shaky coalition that depends on centrists, the party is more moderate. We shall see.

Certainly, Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee has domestic political motives -- strengthening his party so that he does not wake up thrown out by Parliament.

But I think he had more objectives for the tests. Gaining prestige among third-world

powers was one. Another was to shout into the American ear: "Look at us, speak to us, we are India."

Is Mr. Clinton wise or brave enough to reconsider his frantic pursuit of China and the money U.S. businesses hope Beijing will pour over them? Well, at least he can get the shock off his face about Indian independence of action, the murk out of his mind; it's about time.

Ordinary Indians do have hopes and fears about their country, just as if they were ordinary Americans. They are not in a silence mood. Head-patting decades are over.

Washington Post May 15, 1998 Pg. 27

Trashing Of The Test-Ban Treaty

By Stephen S. Rosenfeld

On one point the Indians are right. It is arbitrary and more than a bit arrogant for the United States to make up the world's list of countries certified to possess nuclear weapons, and to do it on the basis of a composite political snapshot taken in the World War II and vintage Cold War years. Only the five countries that started testing in the two decades after 1945 are on that short list.

The Indians are no less right, moreover, in their belief that the company of nations does attach high prestige to full -- declared and deployed -- nuclear-weapon status. Americans have gotten accustomed to shield their nuclear pride so as not to seem they are bragging or throwing their weight around. But in a tight place, the flashing of a nuclear capability becomes a salient aspect of American policy and an instrument in coping with crisis. In the Gulf War, for instance, the American nuclear presence stayed Saddam Hussein's chemical-biological hand and provided the strategic umbrella under which Washington organized the victorious coalition.

It is also so that all along the five declared nuclear states were asking the Indians to accept a measure of self-effacement and self-denial they had repudiated for themselves. The five have reduced the numbers of their deployed weapons, dismantled many of them, loosened the hair trigger

on others, offered substitute security assurances, and so on. They stopped testing. But they would not go to zero nuclear weapons, or anywhere near it -- India's stated price for a nuclear fade-out of its own.

From the start, these tensions between the declared haves and the undeclared partial haves have burdened American efforts to freeze the Indian and Pakistani warhead and missile programs. The more discreet Israeli program always and rightly has been accorded special deference. In the West anyway, there is much respect for Israel's special fear not merely of defeat but of national extinction.

India, though it conducted a weapons-related test in 1974, never claimed a spot on the top list. Like Pakistan and Israel, it had the strategic sense and the political control not to take that crucial leap to declared possession of nuclear arms. Finally, however, its restraint yielded. The Cold War was over, meaning that New Delhi no longer had the Soviet Union to balance off the country Indians regard as their true strategic rival, China. Old-fashioned nationalistic pride appears to have inspired a fledgling Hindu-nationalist government to grasp the status that has long been within its technological reach.

The new tests make India a "global player," crowed an adviser to the prime minister, "and when you are a global player, you have room to nego-

tiate." Hence the cheeky Indian offer now to negotiate the terms of its conditional accession to the very test ban treaty it has just mocked.

The tests do show India's power and technical sophistication. But they also show an unappealing readiness to stick a finger in the world's eye. India has spoiled the test ban treaty. It broke an informal international testing moratorium. It maintained a before-the-fact secrecy more suitable to the launching of a war. Forty-eight hours after the first three unannounced tests, it added political insult to nonproliferation injury by conducting two more tests.

The fact remains that there is overwhelming reason to sustain an imbalance of nuclear rights and privileges that favors some countries over others. The reason is simply that in this category of affairs, change is more disruptive than continuity. The existing pattern may not be entirely fair, but it has decades' worth of precious stability built

into it. The stability serves all countries, regardless of their place in the nuclear scheme of things. This position is not to be dismissed as the (untenable) "high moral ground." It is the ground of cold self-interest.

India seems determined to be acknowledged as the sixth state with declared, deployed and internationally accepted nuclear weapons. China, already a member of the nuclear club, is strongly critical. But as itself a chronic leaker of nuclear assistance to Pakistan, it arrives now at the debate under a cloud. Pakistan's alarm is evident. In an atmosphere already boiling with Indian-Pakistani rivalry, it must balance domestic demands for matching tests against international appeals for restraint.

It is not arrogance that here dictates American nonproliferation policy. It is a concern, however awkwardly expressed, for the global welfare. The arrogance in the equation is India's.

New York Times May 14, 1998 Pg. 29

The Unratified Treaty

By Paul Warnke

WASHINGTON--The decision by India's new Government to openly pursue "the nuclear option" sets that nation on a provocative course that threatens the security of South Asia as well as global efforts to reduce the danger from nuclear weapons everywhere. Pakistan will be motivated to follow India's nuclear testing example, and other states with nuclear ca-

pabilities may be tempted to exploit them.

As President Clinton and Congress seek to address the escalation of nuclear tensions in South Asia, they will be hard-pressed to find a receptive audience for our condemnation of India, Iraq or any other country pursuing weapons of mass destruction if we do not ourselves set the correct example on nuclear testing. Specifically, the Senate must take

prompt action to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the global agreement that would prohibit all tests of nuclear weapons. Some Senate leaders have been preventing consideration of this treaty because they claim the test ban is not a serious priority for the Senate. India's tests should persuade them to take a fresh look.

The United States conducted its last--not, I believe, just its latest--nuclear test in September 1992. Russia stopped in October 1990. France and China finally ended their nuclear tests in 1996 after arousing worldwide indignation, and France now has closed its South Pacific test sites. Britain has no place to test since the American moratorium of 1992 effectively put the Nevada Test Site on standby.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has been signed by 149 nations. Britain and France became the first declared nuclear powers to ratify the treaty, and 11 other nations have also ratified.

None of the five declared nuclear powers should or are likely to resume testing. American ratification of the test ban treaty would thus be an undiluted benefit to our security.

The treaty's prohibition on nuclear explosions makes it much harder for the countries with advanced nuclear weapons, including Russia and China, to produce new and more threatening types. The treaty would not by itself eliminate the possibility of proliferation, but it would make it extremely difficult for new nuclear nations like India and Pakistan to develop smaller, lighter, more sophisticated weapons that could be delivered by ballistic missiles and thus pose a greater threat to the United States.

The test ban treaty is vital to preventing regional arms races. India's nuclear tests will tempt Pakistan to follow and will possibly lead to a dangerous escalation.

Cynics may ask how the ban can restrain India, now that it

has already violated the de facto global moratorium on testing. But only with strong action by the United States and other nations to implement the test ban treaty can we halt weapons testing and development by India and Pakistan.

To back off our own commitment to global adherence to the treaty would only give aid and comfort to nuclear adventurism in South Asia. President Clinton would be in a far better position to help defuse rising nuclear tensions in South Asia when he visits the region later this year--as is currently planned--if the Senate approves the test ban treaty.

The indefinite extension of the Nonproliferation Treaty in May 1995 was won in large part by the commitment of the declared nuclear nations to complete negotiations on a nuclear test ban treaty no later than 1996. With strong American leadership, this target date was met. The Senate's failure to ratify the agreement would constitute a repudiation of this

commitment.

In the next few days, the Clinton Administration can and should continue to press India and Pakistan to refrain from further testing and join the nations that have signed the test ban treaty. American ratification would also enable us to participate in a special conference in September 1999 in which countries that have ratified the treaty will seek ways to encourage other states to adhere to it.

Our security interests and those of the rest of the world can best be served by a global, system that detects and disciplines all would-be proliferators. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is an indispensable safeguard against nuclear devastation. The Senate should act on it favorably, and now.

Paul Warnke, a former director of the Arms Control Disarmament Agency, was the chief arms control negotiator in 1977 and 1978.

Washington Times

May 15, 1998

Pg. 6

INSIDE THE BELTWAY

by John McCaslin

Nuclear intention

The Clinton administration may have been asleep at the wheel during India's "surprise" batch of nuclear tests this week, but it had plenty of advance notice.

Jane's, the leading provider of defense and security information to the world's governments and armed services, including ours, warned in several recent advisories that India and Pakistan were engaged in a nuclear "dance of

war."

"India's new government plans to build nuclear weapons and accelerate production of long-range missiles to deliver them," Jane's wrote on March 25. "For security reasons, the [ruling Bharatiya Janata Party] is convinced that India should be a nuclear weapons power and what is necessary will be done for that, said Brijesh Mishra, the BJP's foreign policy spokesman.

In April 1996, Jane's warned of a "deadly game of nuclear poker" being played on the Indian subcontinent.

"After reports began to emerge late last year of preparations at

India's Pokhran site for a second nuclear test, it became evident last month that Pakistan plans to conduct its first underground nuclear explosion at its Chagai test area.

"Pakistan's actions were no doubt a response aimed at sending a strong signal to New Delhi that Islamabad is ready to match any threat."

Yesterday, the Clinton administration appealed to Pakistan -- which has fought three wars with India over the last 50 years -- to resist the urge to conduct its own nuclear tests. According to some reports, those tests could come as early as Sunday.

Washington Post

May 15, 1998

Pg. 26

For The Record

From an NBC "Today" interview yesterday with Naresh Chandra, India's ambassador to the United States:

Matt Lauer: An end to the exporting of defense and technology material; an end to all military financing; an end to all U.S. credit guarantees; and forbidding U.S. banks from extending credit to India except

to purchase food. So these tests have proved quite costly. Was it worth it?

Ambassador Chandra: You see, the two considerations are different. When it comes to national security consideration, a government has to do what it has got to do. . . . I think in some of the areas, it might be possible to have some substitute or to enter into dialogue with the government of the United States and see how the

implementation of these sanctions can be more refined.

Q: Why was it so important, Mr. Ambassador, for your country to conduct these nuclear tests at this particular time?

A: Well, it's somewhat more obvious to people who are aware of what is going on in our neighborhood. Many . . . have opined that we are living in a tough neighborhood. And we can't be oblivious of what is

going on.

Q: So when Pakistan tested its missiles recently, you felt that that was a provocation of sorts that required a response from India?

A: Well, it's a more long-term perspective than that. . . . We have been watching certain long-term trends in the military relationship which seem to be flourishing, despite advice from very major powers.

Wall Street Journal
May 15, 1998
**Blame the U.S.
For India's Nukes**

By Michael Ledeen

President Clinton and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright should not punish India for its nuclear tests. U.S. policy toward China made it all but inevitable that the Indians would modernize their atomic arsenal. If the "guilty" parties must be punished, the beatings should start at the White House and continue at the State and Commerce Departments. Much of the technology that enabled India stealthily to develop bigger and better nuclear weapons came from America, thanks to an abrupt change in government policy in 1995.

From his first days in office, Mr. Clinton has made it possible for China to buy a vast range of militarily useful technology that will enable it to field a modern army in the foreseeable future. Beijing has purchased everything from advanced machine tools (for building missiles, bombers and fighter planes) to supercomputers, including special software that simulates nuclear tests and thereby allows China to modernize its nuclear arsenal without setting off real bombs. So anyone worried about the extent and sophistication of Chinese nuclear forces will henceforth have to rely on guesswork or extraordinary intelligence operations.

The U.S. seems quite happy to contribute to Chinese military power. Recent news stories have documented the Clinton administration's nonchalance at the discovery that American corporations indirectly helped China's military to develop more-reliable missiles, without obtaining the government approval such assistance required.

Nuclear Fungibility

No serious neighbor could fail to respond in kind to the Chinese military buildup. New Delhi took care to spell out its intentions in advance by formally branding China its greatest potential enemy. The Indian explosions were thus the most explicit possible message to Beijing: We too have modern

nuclear weapons, and don't think you will be able to intimidate us militarily. The Indians showed the Chinese that they have a variety of nuclear weapons, and, by implication, a substantial stockpile (any country willing to explode five bombs must have plenty to spare).

India's nuclear capacity benefited enormously from the Clinton administration's 1995 decision permitting India to purchase American nuclear technology for use in unsafeguarded facilities (those not subject to periodic inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency). Previous presidents had refused to authorize such sales except in rare emergencies, because nuclear technology is fungible. Any country interested in secretly building nuclear weapons would ask for technology for peaceful purposes and divert it to its military facilities. Devices for "environmental" purposes could also be used to help hide clandestine weapons programs from international inspectors and from U.S. detection systems.

Nonetheless, claiming concern for the environment and human safety, the administration authorized the sale of a vast range of technology to unsafeguarded Indian sites--despite warnings from some Pentagon officials that the Indians were likely to use them for their military program. We sold them supercomputers and advanced CAD/CAM software that they could use for weapons design. We sold them advanced control-room technology and devices for artificial-intelligence-based monitoring, along with robotics technology that could be used to handle dangerous materials.

The presumed principal site of the Indian nuclear weapons program is the Bhabha Atomic Research Center at Trombay, just north of Bombay. It contains two research reactors and a plutonium extraction plant, none of which are subject to IAEA inspection. But Bhabha is only one of an impressive array of similar facilities, all recipients of American technology, and none under IAEA surveillance. There are unsafeguarded facilities capable of producing weapons-grade plutonium across the country. It

would be a serious challenge to monitor such a large program even if the facilities were safeguarded; it would require an extraordinarily effective operation to spy on all these unsafeguarded sites.

The Central Intelligence Agency has been rightly criticized for its failure to detect India's detonation plans in advance. But far graver are the policy decisions that made the explosions possible by enhancing India's nuclear arsenal. The CIA's failure stems from a lack of human intelligence--a manpower problem that can be remedied over time--while the policy catastrophe bespeaks a lack of understanding of international politics. It was naive to think that India, which exploded its first nuclear device in 1974, wouldn't exploit our technology to strengthen its nuclear program. If the administration had been serious about nonproliferation, it would have insisted that the U.S. be permitted to inspect all the sites that received American technology. Failing that, the shipments should have been vetoed.

Washington had warned the Indians that tough sanctions would follow any nuclear explosions. New Delhi was not cowed. Perhaps India had noticed that many times during Mr. Clinton's presidency various countries have gotten away with ignoring U.S. warnings. Saddam Hussein was not scared by warnings of harsh reprisals if he invaded northern Iraq two summers ago or if he threw American inspectors out of the country; North Korea has walked out of the nuclear deal with the U.S.; Israel is balking at Mr. Clinton's insistence on further land for Yasser Arafat's regime; the Europeans and the Russians are bullying us into retreating from our insistence on sanctions against Iraq, Iran and Cuba. In each case, we talked tough and warned other nations not to call our bluff. They called it every time, and we folded.

It is therefore unlikely that we will have any long-term success in convincing Pakistan to refrain from matching India's demonstration of nuclear power.

The precedent is not promising: We failed to take action

when China provided Pakistan with military assistance, even when American technology was involved. And one must wonder how long Japan can afford to stay out of the mounting Asian militarization. The Japanese are clearheaded enough to recognize a security threat when they see one.

The Indians' brash challenge may yet serve a useful purpose if it concentrates our minds on the real problems we face. We cannot blithely arm the world's most populous nation without causing tremors throughout the globe. We cannot assume that nations will act in accordance with the highest moral principles. History shows that war, and the preparation for war, is the most common human activity. If we truly want peace, we must deprive potential enemies of powerful weapons.

Ever since the end of the Cold War, we have heard Mr. Clinton and his friends tell us that the economy is the central fact of life, as if wealth were a substitute for might. Machiavelli scorned such nonsense. "Men, steel, money and bread are the sinews of war," he wrote, "but of these four, the first two are more important, because men and steel find gold and bread, but bread and gold do not find men and steel."

What Wars Are Made Of

The situation in Asia has what real wars are made of: social and economic malaise combined with mounting military power. Our own blunders have made matters considerably worse than they might have been. American supercomputers and software have given both India and China the ability to build new, more lethal nuclear weapons without conducting tests we can monitor, while we do not have the spies necessary to ferret out the truth on the ground.

The world's two most populous nations are arming themselves with the best weapons American technology can design. Our own ability to influence events has been gravely weakened. And we owe a large part of this mess to our own folly.

Mr. Ledeen is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute.

Chicago Tribune

May 14, 1998

Agency: Senate Bill Could Imperil Arms Ban

By Ray Moseley
Tribune Foreign Correspondent

LONDON -- Legislation in the U.S. Senate could undermine an international convention to ban chemical weapons, an official of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons warned on Wednesday.

John Gee, deputy director general of the new international agency, said in a telephone interview from his offices in The Hague, Netherlands, that the agency is concerned about a Senate bill to implement the convention. A vote on the bill is scheduled to take place between May 20 and 22.

Gee said a principal worry was over a provision in the legislation that would bar the organization from taking any chemical sample collected by one of its inspection teams outside the U.S. for analysis.

The convention gives primacy to on-site analysis, but in cases in which this proves unsatisfactory or a country does not have adequate laboratory facilities, the organization has the right to take samples abroad.

"I know the U.S. is proposing to ban samples being taken abroad to protect its property interests, but those interests are protected by the procedures we have adopted," Gee said.

Gee and Jose Bustani, the organization's director general, have written to several senators telling them the legislation could encourage other countries to follow the U.S. example, and that could wreck the treaty.

The 1992 convention has been ratified by 106 countries and another 62 have signed but not yet ratified it. Thirteen, including Iraq, have declined to sign. The U.S. is among several countries that have not submitted full declarations of their chemical weapons stocks to the organization in The Hague.

"There is a very low probability that any U.S. chemical samples would need to be taken abroad, but if the United States refuses to allow this, then other states will also," Gee said. "If

Iran refused, for example, to allow its chemical samples to be analyzed abroad, what credence would the United States give to analyses carried out inside Iran?"

Several states have indicated informally they will not allow the transfer of samples abroad for analysis if such transfers are prohibited by the U.S., he said.

Gee said the convention contains ample measures to guard against trade secrets and national security information being compromised, and the convention has the full support of the U.S. Chemical Manufacturers Association.

He said another major concern was a provision in the Senate measure that would give the U.S. president the right to veto certain inspections by the organization in The Hague on grounds of national security.

No other signatory to the convention has sought to block so-called challenge inspections, and if the U.S. does so, then "everybody else will do likewise, and the U.S. will gut the convention, depriving it of any meaningful teeth," Gee said.

Under the convention, any country that suspects another signatory nation is in violation of its terms can trigger a challenge inspection, which takes place within 72 hours.

Former President George Bush first advanced the concept of challenge inspections when he was vice president in 1984, and other nations agreed it would be crucial to monitoring treaty compliance.

Gee said two other provisions of the U.S. legislation were of concern to his organization, but were "not nearly as important" as the first two.

One would place unilateral limitations on the number of routine inspections that might be conducted at U.S. industrial facilities. The convention allows up to two inspections of each such facility per year, but the U.S. is proposing to allow just one.

The other provision refers to concentration limits of chemical mixtures and solutions and would have the effect, Gee said, of excluding from U.S.

declarations on chemical weapons stocks a considerable number of U.S. industrial facilities.

Other states have set far lower thresholds than the U.S. is proposing, and Gee said the U.S. could lay itself open to the charge that it was seeking unilateral advantage over other states in implementation of the convention.

In a written statement, Bustani said: "If one state enacts

restrictions on the conduct of inspections, so will others, thus virtually destroying the inspectorate's ability to monitor treaty compliance."

As a result, he said, the inaugural year of the convention's implementation could be followed by a year in which the new disarmament regime "begins to crumble."

"The question . . . is whether the United States, the key player which put so much effort into the creation of this unique convention, will fortify or weaken its noble objectives," he wrote.

San Diego Union-Tribune May 14, 1998

More Funds For Defense Requested GOP senators seek budget-rule change

By Otto Kreisher
Copley News Service

WASHINGTON -- Two GOP senators with great power over federal spending yesterday called for changes in the balanced budget agreement to increase defense spending, but the chances appear slim.

The chairman of the Budget Committee, Pete Domenici of New Mexico, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Ted Stevens of Alaska, also urged the Defense Department to improve pay, health care and retirement benefits for service personnel to overcome difficulties in recruiting and retention.

The 1996 budget accord between the Republican-led Congress and President Clinton that should produce the first balanced budgets in decades set tight limits, or caps, on the major elements of federal spending, including defense.

Stevens, opening a hearing on the proposed Pentagon budget, said the defense limits are not high enough to allow the Pentagon to pay for its operational commitments, take care of its troops and buy new weapons.

"Despite the good faith effort on all sides, I think we should all recognize that the amounts we agreed to are not sufficient to meet the needs for operations, quality of life, and modernization of our military . . .

I believe there should be an

increase in the caps so that we can take care of that problem," he said.

Domenici, who is a member of the Defense Appropriations subcommittee, as well as chairman of the budget-drafting panel, declared: "I'm for raising the caps on defense."

"We now have very big surpluses. Everybody and his uncle are figuring out ways to spend it," he said. "I have not heard anybody say, 'Well, what about defense?' I'm saying it right now."

The prospects of adjusting the spending limits does not appear bright, however. A letter requesting a higher defense limit, signed by the top Republicans and Democrats on the House National Security Committee, was rejected by House and Senate GOP leaders.

And Sen. Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey, who is the top Democratic member of the Budget Committee, quickly informed his chairman and Stevens that "I do have some concerns . . . about breaking the caps because we worked like the devil to get ourselves a balanced budget."

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen told the appropriations panel that "all of us would like to see more" money for defense. But he said he knows that is unlikely. "So we are doing our best to live within the caps."

Domenici later noted that

the booming national economy is making it hard for the services to recruit personnel and to retain trained technicians.

He urged Cohen to reconsider what level of pay, health care, retirement and other "quality of life" factors are needed to attract and retain the people the services need.

Cohen also appealed for renewal of the base closing commission, or BRAC.

"I know that BRAC is a four-letter word, but it's something that we have to look forward to in terms of getting some efficiencies and eliminating some of the overhead that

we have that's very costly," he said.

Stevens countered with a demand that Cohen cut some of the Pentagon management structure.

Cohen said he is cutting one-third of his staff and has ordered reductions in other civilian and military managers, but he would need legislative authority to make more drastic changes in defense organizations.

"You draft me the law to give you that authority . . . and I'll introduce it," Stevens said. "If you do that, we get you the authority. Then I'll support your base closure commission."

Austria Takes Slow Steps Toward NATO

VIENNA, Austria (AP) — Neutral Austria's entry into NATO is "only a question of when, not if," Foreign Minister Wolfgang Schuessel said Thursday.

Speaking as Austria prepares to assume the rotating six-month presidency of the European Union for the first time, Schuessel said the question of NATO membership was unlikely to advance before the alliance's Washington summit in 1999, where NATO will likely admit its first three ex-

communist members — Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

Austria adopted a policy of neutrality in 1955 after 10 years of post-World War II Allied occupation.

Schuessel, who heads Austria's conservative People's Party, has pushed consistently for NATO membership, arguing that the end of the Cold War has changed the nature of the 49-year-old Atlantic alliance and that neutrality is no longer an option.

San Diego Union-Tribune

May 14, 1998

Firms Review Napalm-Disposal Project's Scope

By Susan Gembrowski
Staff Writer

Company representatives interested in bidding on a contract to dispose of 23 million pounds of Vietnam War-era napalm stored at a Navy facility in Fallbrook took a firsthand look yesterday at the on-site processing plant.

"They were given a tour of the on-site operations at Fallbrook and provided information on the scope of the project, including disposal requirements," Navy spokeswoman Jeanne Light said.

The Navy and its prime disposal contractor, Ohio-based Battelle Memorial Institute, have said that numerous firms are interested in helping them get rid of the jellylike sub-

stance that has been stored at the Fallbrook Naval Weapons Facility since the 1970s. Both have declined to release information about the companies or where they are located.

But operators of a West Texas waste dump said yesterday their company will bid on the estimated \$2.5 million disposal contract.

Waste Control Specialists hopes to extract the benzene and gasoline from the napalm to sell as fuel. The remaining polystyrene would be buried at its facility in Andrews County, about six miles from the New Mexico state line.

The Navy and Battelle have been looking for someone to take the napalm after an Indiana company backed out of its

contract to recycle it as alternative fuel in cement-manufacturing kilns.

The first 12,000-gallon shipment of napalm already had left Fallbrook when Pollution Control Industries of East Chicago, Ind. reneged, citing local and political opposition.

The train carrying the napalm was stopped in Kansas City, Kan., and returned to California. The hazardous waste is being stored at China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station in the Mojave Desert about 250 miles northeast of San Diego.

So far, the kind of local opposition that scuttled the Indiana company's bid to get the napalm is not a problem in West Texas.

"We live with so many haz-

ardous things that come through this town all the time," said Liz Stottlemire, chairwoman of the Andrews Chamber of Commerce, who supports the napalm-recycling bid. "It's going to be safer than the gasoline trucks that come through."

Battelle built the \$5 million one-of-a-kind facility at the Fallbrook Navy site where the 500-and 750-pound aluminum canisters containing napalm are punched and drained into sealed tankers.

The plant had been in operation since early March, but was shut down Friday while the Navy and Battelle search for a new subcontractor.

An Associated Press dispatch was used in this report.

Denver Post

Air Force Training Planes To Remain Grounded

By Jim Mallory
Special to The Denver Post

May 14 - COLORADO SPRINGS - Top Air Force officials said Wednesday that the T-3 "Firefly" is a safe airplane, but the planes will remain grounded while changes are made to their fuel systems and the programs used to train instructors and student pilots.

Three instructor pilots and three Air Force Academy cadets have died in crashes in-

volving the T-3 during the three years the plane has been used to determine if cadets should receive further pilot training.

"We believe the T-3 Firefly is a good, safe tool," said Air Force Assistant Vice Chief of Staff Lt. Gen. David Vesely.

At least 16 other crashes

In addition to the three fatal Colorado crashes, T-3s have been involved in at least 16 nonfatal crashes worldwide.

May 14, 1998

Air Force officials said Wednesday. The plane also is used by Canadian and British forces.

Air Force records also contain dozens of reports of sudden, unexplained engine stoppages, most of them occurring while planes were still on the ground.

Despite assurances that it is safe, the two-seat propeller-driven airplanes will remain grounded until the summer of 1999 while at least 10 modifications to the fuel system are made and training programs are rewritten.

"Until we are confident the necessary changes have been

made, we will not re-institute student screening," said Lt. Gen. David McIlvoy, vice commander of the Air Force Education and Training Command.

The planes were grounded in July 1997 because of the unexpected engine stoppages, Vesely said.

In all, more than 48 changes to the T-3 program were recommended by a team of Air Force experts, according to Col. David Moody, who headed the review.

More instruction recommended

Moody said his team rec-

ommended more testing of the T-3, modifications to the fuel system, revisions to the flight and maintenance manuals, more instruction in handling spins and fewer aerobatics in training.

McIlvoy said program changes would also include quadrupling the number of hours spent in training instructor pilots. Ground instruction

for cadets will be extended as well, McIlvoy said.

McIlvoy said mechanical changes to the T-3 would include additional fuelsystem cooling as well as straightening and shortening the fuel lines. Earlier this year, Gen. Lloyd Newton, chief of the Training and Education Command, estimated the mechanical changes

would cost about \$6.2 million.

"All 110 T-3s (used by the Air Force) should be done by late November," McIlvoy said. There are 53 T-3s at the academy, spokesman Staff Sgt. Tony Hill said.

Academy Superintendent Lt. Gen. Tad Oelstrom said the T-3 program isn't essential for cadets to become pilots.

"It screens out folks who

have a low probability of success (in completing pilot training)," Oelstrom said. "If you are good enough to succeed in pilot training, you will make it with or without screening."

Air Force experts ruled out Colorado's altitude as a possible cause of the fatal accidents. "We can safely operate the T-3 at this altitude," Vesely said.

Cuba's Fictional Threat To The U.S.

Chicago Tribune May 14, 1998

A recent Department of Defense report declaring that Cuba poses no military threat to the U.S. was hardly an earthshaker. You don't need to be Karl von Clausewitz to figure out that after the gusher of Soviet subsidies dried up in 1989, Cuba has barely been able to keep food on the table and the lights on in Havana, much less maintain an attack force that could threaten anyone.

Normally that would be considered good news. But in the upside-down realm of U.S.-Cuba relations--in which so much of our policy is premised on perpetual confrontation and the imagined Cuban threat to the hemisphere--the report turned out to be somewhat of a stink bomb.

Defense Secretary William Cohen sent it back for "further analysis." When the Defense Intelligence Agency--hardly a coven of Castro cheerleaders--replied there was nothing to re-analyze, Cohen drafted a transmittal letter to Congress that conjured up some threats and hypothesized about the possibility of others.

If anything, the report reminded us once again how U.S. hyperventilations about Cuba make less sense every day, as a matter of fact or in proportion to other foreign policy challenges lurking elsewhere in the world. Indeed, if the Castro regime poses any threat to the U.S. at all, it could be far more effectively handled through direct contacts and negotiations rather than recriminations and isolation.

Since 1989, the report noted, Cuba has had to cut its military budget in half. In its per capita military spending, Cuba today is comparable to such superpowers as Bolivia and El Salvador. Its military equipment, including the air force, is mostly in mothballs or being cannibalized for spare parts. Fuel is in such short supply that pilots can only do 30 hours of practice flying yearly. Though any land battle in Cuba would be extremely bloody, its apogee as a military power is long gone.

As Cohen indicated, Russia still maintains a spy station in Cuba and was helping Cuba build a nuclear generating plant using unsafe and outdated Chernobyl-type technology. Construction was halted 10 years ago when Soviet interest and money vanished.

It's very unlikely that either the Cubans or the Russians can find the estimated \$800 million needed to finish the plant. But if the U.S. wants to be sure the plant is built properly--or not at all--that would be more effectively accomplished by dealing directly with the Castro regime instead of pretending it doesn't exist.

Cohen also expressed fears about the potential fallout from a violent upheaval in Cuba. But then again, the surest way to prevent such mayhem would be for the U.S. to work toward a peaceful transition through open trade and negotiations--or precisely the opposite of what this nation is doing now.

Ft. Worth Star-Telegram

May 14, 1998

The UAE's F-16s

Call it \$7 billion worth of breathing room.

The announcement this week that the United Arab Emirates will buy 80 F-16 Fighting Falcons from Lockheed Martin guarantees at least four years of life to the assembly line in Fort Worth.

The United States may not be interested in buying additional F-16s when the Air Force's final order is filled in 2001, but our allies certainly find the precision fighter attractive. Taiwan is still taking delivery of its order for 150 planes placed in 1992 after then-President Bush lifted the ban on the sale of fighter jets to the island nation. The UAE contract should keep the line humming through 2005 at a minimum.

The new contract also should boost employment at the west side production facility by 2,000 workers, meaning 13,000 em-

ployees by the year 2001. Although still a long way from the boom days of the 1980s, when the plant employed 30,000 people, any increase in good-paying jobs is welcomed.

Asia and the Middle East have been the bread-and-butter markets for defense contractors since the Cold War. But the economic crisis battering the Pacific Rim has forced many Asian nations to delay or cancel orders for American-made fighter planes. Earlier this year, Thailand was looking for a way out of its \$390 million contract with Boeing to buy eight F-18 Hornets.

That makes strengthened relations with nations like the UAE, and the recent Senate vote to expand NATO to include the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary, all the more important for the future viability of companies so vital to the local economy. Since the United States has made the decision to downsize the military, defense contractors will have to look elsewhere for a market for these made-in-America mechanical marvels.

Wall Street Journal

May 15, 1998

Pg. 1

Washington Wire

**A Special Weekly Report From
The Wall Street Journal's
Capital Bureau**

CLINTONITES SEEK ways to cool Pakistan's response to India's nuclear tests.

Top U.S. officials arrive in Pakistan today to try to persuade it not to answer with tests of its own. Pakistan likely will ask for the 28 fighter jets it paid for years ago but never got after Congress blocked the deal. But arms-control and State Department officials balk, not wanting to unduly offend India.

Instead, the envoys might discuss forgiving over \$1 billion in Pakistan debt. But U.S. intelligence officials doubt the Pakistanis will be dissuaded from responding with their own test. Former CIA chief Woolsey defends the agency for not spotting India's blasts: "If you had to watch Iran, Iraq, North Korea and India, who would be at the bottom of your list?"

Heavy Fighting Reported in Kosovo

PRISTINA, Yugoslavia—Heavy fighting erupted southwest of Kosovo's capital after ethnic Albanian militants attacked a Serbian police station, injuring three officers.

Machine-gun fire and heavy artillery could be heard and smoke rose from the area near Djakovica, which was sealed off by police. The skirmish came a day before President Slobodan Milosevic and ethnic Albanian leader Ibrahim Rugova meet in the Serbian capital, Belgrade, to discuss the future of the restive Yugoslav province.

Peacekeepers Sweep Through Bosnian Town

SARAJEVO, Bosnia—Hundreds of NATO-led peacekeepers swept through buildings formerly housing the Bosnian Serb government in the Serbian stronghold of Pale. Arriving in more than 30 armored vehicles, 500 soldiers began an inspection that NATO said was aimed at verifying the legitimacy of police activity in Pale, 10 miles east of Sarajevo. The nationality of the troops was not disclosed.

The operation follows the recent relocation of the Bosnian Serb government institutions to the northwestern town of Banja Luka. However, some police units remain deployed at the facilities in Pale, long a base for Serb hard-liners.

U.N. approves compromise on Iraqi nuclear inspections

UNITED NATIONS — In a compromise reached by U.S. and Russian diplomats, the Security Council agreed yesterday to con-

sider scaling back nuclear inspections in Iraq — but not right away.

The council said Iraq must first make "substantive clarifications" about its nuclear weapons program, which Iraq claims to have dismantled in 1991.

The action is meant to give

Baghdad a signal that sanctions, imposed after it invaded Kuwait in August 1990, are not eternal if it cooperates with arms inspectors. But Iraq's U.N. ambassador, Nizar Hamdoun, called the council action "too little too late."

Monitors Picked Up Only 1 Of 5 India Blasts

New York Times May 15, 1998

By William J. Broad

Only one of the five nuclear tests that India announced this week was detected by the thousands of seismometers around the world set up to track earthquakes and atomic blasts, renewing a debate among experts about how effectively a test ban treaty can be monitored.

Some weapons analysts say the failure to detect four of the tests -- only the largest, on Monday, was registered -- has landed a body blow to the international monitoring system set up as part of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Others say the lack of data on the four blasts is insignificant, and that scientists might fill the void in the coming weeks as more information is studied.

"It raises very serious questions about the verifiability of this treaty," said Frank Gaffney Jr., a former Pentagon official who directs the Center for Security Policy, a research group in Washington that opposes many of the Clinton administration's arms-control goals.

But Dr. Gregory van der Vink, director of planning at Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology, a scien-

tific consortium in Washington, strongly disagreed.

While acknowledging that "we really have only one seismic signature, and that's from Monday's blast," he added:

"This is not a failure of the international monitoring system but a recognition that there will always be some level below which we won't have a high certainty of making detections."

For generations, arms controllers advocating a global ban on the underground testing of nuclear weapons have said that such a treaty could be policed by seismometers.

The Clinton administration has championed not only the test ban treaty, which it signed in 1996, but the construction of a global network of seismometers to achieve the monitoring goal. The system costs hundreds of millions of dollars to build and run.

The vivid demonstration of the system's weakness is likely to stir a further debate, in military and diplomatic circles, over the usefulness of a policeman who can catch only one in five offenders, and perhaps of the law giving the policeman such authority.

In its announcements this week, India said it conducted a

series of nuclear test detonations beneath its northwestern desert, three on Monday and two more on Wednesday. But given the lack of independent evidence, the rest of the world only has India's word about the size and scope of most of the announced blasts, or even whether they took place at all.

Certainly India already seems to be exaggerating its achievement. Estimates by Indian seismologists of the explosive energy of Monday's large blast are more than double those of American experts.

For the Monday series, India said one was a "thermonuclear device," meaning it had more force than an atomic bomb. And it said the tests on Wednesday were in the "sub-kiloton range," meaning they had a force of less than 1,000 tons of high explosive.

A bizarre twist, van der Vink said, given that India and Pakistan are old foes, is that the best seismic data on the Indian blast came from a seismometer in Pakistan, 435 miles from the Indian test site.

The seismogram of a Monday blast, van der Vink said, held a hint of what was perhaps another blast signature.

The clue is a tiny ripple in the flat line of the tracing before it zigs and zags wildly as energy from the blast was received and recorded. That tiny blip, he said, might have been caused by an earthquake or a small bomb detonated just before the big one.

Van der Vink said that the energy of the large blast appeared to be equal to about 25,000 tons of high explosive, or about half of what Indian scientists have claimed.

The general aim of test-ban monitoring, he added, is to detect globally any nuclear blast larger than 1,000 tons of high explosive.

So the system might be expected to catch three of India's five blasts, the two others being in the sub-kiloton range.

Dr. Paul Richards, a seismologist at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory in Palisades, N.Y., said other detections might be made as analysis progressed and as data came in from remote seismometers inaccessible by phone line.

"Lots of seismologists are trying to find signs of these other announced tests," he said. "We may succeed when we look closely at the data."

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski **NEWS DIRECTOR:** Taft Phoebus **EARLY BIRD EDITOR:** Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe **ADMINISTRATION:** Wendy Powers **PRODUCTION:** Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)